

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JULY, 1893.

ARTICLE I.

HOLMAN LECTURE ON THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

ARTICLE VII.—OF THE CHURCH.

By P. BERGSTRESSER, D. D., Middletown, Md.,

They likewise teach, that there will always be one holy Church. But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is correctly taught, and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions, that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere observed. As Paul says: "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc.

The points contained in this article are: The Perpetuity, the Essential Nature, the True Unity, and the Cultus of the Church. Let us follow the order here given by the fathers.

I. *The Perpetuity of the Church.* Our Lutheran Fathers taught and confessed "that there will always be one holy Church." By this statement they confessed to the Emperor, that, though they had rejected many rites and ceremonies of men, they were still members of the Church of Christ, and justly entitled to the protection of the government. In this they adhered to the

material principle, justification by faith, out of which the Church is born, and developed, and without which it cannot be perpetuated; for every living organism must have a principle of life, from which it must ever spring forth into new vigor and life. This is what we teach and confess as Lutherans with respect to the Church. We are sure that we have the germ of the fulness of the Gospel of Christ. The Lutheran Church originated in the material principle, in the depth of Christian consciousness, in an experience of sin and redemption. Luther says: "These three things, faith, Christ, and imputation, must be joined together. Faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him enclosed, as the ring doth the precious stone. And whoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ apprehended in the heart, him will God count for righteous. And this acceptance, or imputation, is very necessary: first, because we are not yet perfectly righteous, but while we remain in this life, sin dwells still in our flesh; and this remnant of sin God purgeth in us. Moreover, we are sometimes left by the Holy Ghost, and fall into sin, as did Peter and David, and many other holy men. Notwithstanding we have always recourse to this article: 'That our sins are covered, and that God will not lay them to our charge.' Not that sin is not in us (as the Papists have taught, saying, that we must always be working well until we feel that there is no guilt of sin remaining in us); yea, sin is indeed always in us, and the godly do feel it, but it is covered, and not imputed unto us by God, for Christ's sake: whom, because we do apprehend by faith, all our sins are now no sins. But where Christ and faith be not, there is no remission or covering of sins, but mere imputation of sins and condemnation. Thus will God glorify his Son, and will be glorified himself."

It will be perceived, in this quotation, that Luther's view of justification by faith, includes the Christian's consciousness of an indwelling Christ. If "faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him inclosed," then the Christian *has* "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." For if we cannot be happy until we see ourselves perfectly conformed to the Law, we shall never be able to attain to peace of conscience. Justification is therefore that act of God by which

he counts our faith in Christ for righteousness. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Abraham's faith was not righteousness in itself, but it was counted by God for it. Just as currency is not gold, but it is counted or reckoned for gold, because it rests on the credit of the government; so faith is not righteousness, but it is counted or reckoned by God for righteousness, in the matter of justification, because it rests, by the power of the Holy Ghost, on Christ whom it holds inclosed. There is no doubt about this, that the ground of an unseen future is a present Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith. As the drawing of the breath is itself the sure proof of the existence of the life-bringing atmosphere which we breathe, so is also the act of that faith which lays hold of Christ, has him present, holds him inclosed, and draws strength from him, the most satisfactory proof of the fact that our future possessions are more than mere fancies and chimeras. When Abraham's faith was counted unto him for righteousness, he was not at once made righteous in the absolute sense; but he afterwards grew into a personal righteousness, or the new obedience, as fast as was consistent with the Divine discipline in grace. This growth in personal holiness and righteousness is called sanctification.

In this direction lies the differences between the Romish doctrine of justification and that of the Lutheran Church. The Romanists say: "We come to justification on the way of holiness;" the Lutherans say: "We come to holiness on the way of justification by faith." It must be evident to any spiritual mind, that we must first be conscious of the grace of God, before we can render to him the spontaneous love of our hearts; that we must first be reconciled with God, before we can live in fellowship with him; and that every holy, obedient life is only the thankful answer of the gift of Divine grace. We become conscious, however, of this grace of God only through faith in Christ. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience;

and patience, experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." This is appropriated Christianity, implanted in the heart of the individual. This new power, associated and in union with our essential nature, may now work in us what it will,—Christian liberty, the new consciousness, the Divine adoption, indeed, the new man, the new creature. For the eternal atonement or reconciliation reaching down to the deepest foundation of the conscience is now found. "Living in time, the believer now knows himself to be living in the eternal life, knows the heavens open above him, and in the heavens his Father. Out of a doubting and divided being he has now become in his inmost nature one; for he participates in him who is in his person the principle of the union of all oppositions in the universe. He knows himself to be united with the center of all truth in heaven and on earth, and has found the most precious treasure, religious certainty of the Christian salvation, the *fides divina*."

It was with the Latin word *justificatus* that Luther had so much trouble. He gathered his ideas of justification from its derivatives, which in combination literally mean *to be made just* or *righteous*. And the Romish teaching was that the sinner must come to justification by his own righteousness. To make himself just or righteous in the Roman sense, Luther became a monk. To this end he entered the Augustinian Convent at Erfurt, July 17, 1505, where he subjected himself to the severest monastic discipline and humble services of sweeper, porter and beggar. His deep mental conflicts, penances and mortifications of the flesh, seriously undermined his health and brought him to the brink of despair. It was not until Luther looked into his Greek Testament, and found the word *δικαιόω*, that he discovered his error. He found that the Greek word means to acknowledge and declare any one to be that which he ought to be, and to treat him as such. These ascetic exercises, however, led Luther more and more to a knowledge of his own moral helplessness, and to the cross of Christ as the only source of justifi-

cation. "*A man is justified out of grace, through faith,*" said Staupitz, from St. Bernard, to the heart-sick young German monk, without dreaming for a moment, that he was planting the seed of the old Gospel in a soil from which it would grow and be perpetuated to fill all the earth."

We must therefore guard against the misconception of this subject, which makes justification by faith only a doctrinal position. It must here be taken as an expression of Christianity in the inner man, for the principle of regeneration, for the development of the new creature in Christ Jesus, in whom the certainty of the forgiveness of sins, and the adoption into the family of God,—and, accordingly, the certainty of the glorious freedom of the sons of God—is the centre of a new spiritual life. Luther's standpoint was the consciousness of "the freedom of a Christian man," the divinely inspired certainty of union with Christ through faith; the sure confidence that such faith has, not only outside of itself, but in itself, the spirit that leads into all truth.

"Deeply was this doctrine written in Luther's heart. Like a charm it stole upon his agitated and agonized conscience in the cloister at Erfurt. Like a voice from heaven it flashed upon him while attempting, by way of penance, to climb upon his knees up Pilate's staircase at Rome, and filled his soul, as it has the soul of many a sinner, with the glad consciousness of acceptance in Jesus. "I felt myself born again as a new man," says he, "and I entered by an open door into the very Paradise of God. From that hour I saw the Holy Scriptures with other eyes. And the allusion to 'the righteousness of God,' which I before detested, I began from that time to value and love as the sweetest and most consolatory of truths. This text of St. Paul, 'The just shall live by faith,' was to me the very gate of heaven."

"In all his subsequent labors for God and the Church, Luther never ceased to proclaim this doctrine, as the vital essence and sum of the Reformation he preached; yea, as the article by which the Church must stand or fall. "If this single doctrine remains pure," says he, "the whole Church will also remain pure, harmonious, and without factions." Indeed, like Paul, he seemed to know nothing but justification by faith in the Son of God, crucified for sin. It was wrought in him. It permeated

his whole being. It was welded in his spirit. It was the center to which all his thoughts, feelings and hopes gravitated. It was the spring from which all his heroic impulses came. It was the secret of his strength, both before God and man. As soon might immortal mind be annihilated, as this great truth displaced from his immortal soul."*

This was, also, the position of all the Confessors. They maintained that our Churches are Churches of Christ, founded upon the true apostolic principle, justification by faith, and that their purgation from dead works, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, did not exclude them from the one perpetual holy Church.

II. *The Essential Nature of the Church.*—What, then, is the Church? Our Article defines it thus: "But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is correctly taught, and the sacraments are properly administered." "Our adversaries," says Melancthon in the Apology, "condemn the seventh article of our Confession, in which we say, that the Christian Church is the congregation of saints. They talk at length to show, that the wicked or ungodly ought not to be separated from the Church, because John the Baptist compares the Church to a floor, on which wheat and chaff are heaped together; and because Christ compares it to a net, containing fishes both bad and good."

The points for discussion, therefore, in this section of our Article, are the essential nature of the Church, the correct preaching of the Gospel, and the proper administration of the sacraments.

It is with the Church *invisible* that we have especially to do in discussing our Article, while the Church *visible* is more prominently set forth in the eighth Article.

In the Creed we say: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints," etc. Luther places a comma instead of a semicolon between 'the holy Christian Church, and the communion of saints,' which makes the latter explanatory of the former. Luther says: "The terms are per-

*Ecclesia Lutherana, p. 62.

flectly equivalent. Formerly the latter clause, *Communione Sanctorum*, was not employed; and it is also unhappily and unintelligibly rendered in German *eine Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*. It should be rendered *eine Christliche Gemeinde*, a Christian community or congregation." He renders the whole therefore thus: "The holy Christian Church, the community of saints." This rendering corresponds with our Article, and means the Church *invisible*, which is the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. "The following," says Luther, "is the true import of the words which were added,—*Communione Sanctorum*: "I believe that there is a holy congregation and community on earth, of pure saints, under one head Christ, called together through the Holy Ghost, in one faith, mind, and understanding, with various gifts—yet concordant in love, free of heresy and dissension. I also believe that I am a part and member of these, a participant and copartner of all the blessings which they have,—brought in and incorporated with them, by the Holy Ghost, through my having heard, and still continue to hear the word of God,—which is the first step towards entering into this community. For before we had come to this, we were entirely the subjects of Satan, as those who knew nothing of God and Christ. Thus until the last day, the Holy Ghost will remain with this holy community or Christian Church, through which he persuades us, and which he uses for the purpose of promulgating and exercising the word; by which he effects sanctification, extending the Church, so that it daily increases, and becomes stronger in faith and the fruits which he produces."

From these remarks and the text of the article under consideration we therefore infer that "the Church is the congregation or community of the saints," the Church *invisible*. This community is distinguished from the world by the law or principle of spiritual life in Christ Jesus, which holds them together in Christian fellowship, and delivers them from the law of sin and death. That which all Christians or saints enjoy and hold in common is the glorified Lord through faith, not only historically in their understandings, but also experimentally in their hearts. As St. Paul writes to the Church of the Ephesians:

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the Church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." To belong to such a community is the best part of life, and has the promise of the life which is to come. What should be dearer to the Christian's heart than the Church of Christ? It is our spiritual home. It is God's temple, which must not be defiled. For the guilt of impairing a building is enhanced in proportion to the dignity of the being who inhabits the edifice. In as far, then, as believers constitute the living and holy temple of God, filled with the divine Spirit, any one who disfigures in himself or another any part of this temple, incurs the heaviest guilt. The Church is God's residence. "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." The Church is the Golden Candlestick in the Sanctuary, to give light to a benighted world. "The light shineth in darkness." The children of the kingdom are to illuminate the world. The Church catches and forms the rays of him who is himself the light, and reflects them into the world. The Church is the bearer of the New Covenant. In the New Covenant God does not write his law outwardly, as a cold requirement, on tables of stone, but he writes it on the hearts and in the minds of his people; he therefore first gives to the people and then asks from them; he first gives them justifying grace, a new heart, a regenerate spirit, pleasure, love, and joy in God's will, and then he requires of them; nor does he require in vain; for he then is truly the people's God, worshiped and beloved by them, and in consequence of this, the people can then also be truly his people, protected

and blessed by him. In the New Covenant it is shown plainly that the fulfillment of the law is to rest on the inner disposition. Every one here personally, and from his inmost experience, knows and acknowledges the Lord. "In which Church God daily and richly forgives me, and all other believers, all our sins." The difference between the Old and the New Covenant is this. In the old stands the law first, and lays down its requirements, which man cannot fulfill, because he wants the power and the spirit, the power of faith and the spirit of love. In the New it is free grace, the forgiveness of sins, and reconciliation, that stands first, and in the heart whose sins have been forgiven, love springs up, and from love springs the strength and the inclination for holiness, and the personal experience of the knowledge of God. For mere theory does not constitute Christian knowledge. In order to know God, our inner idea of such a being must be verified by experience. For until the heart has found by blessed experience that being whom our reason has inferred from the works of nature to exist, we still are destitute of a true knowledge of God. God is hid from the unrenewed heart. The knowledge of God to such a person is yet only idea or notion. That person is like a child seeking its father through a deep tangled, wild wood, by certain foot-prints, which it takes to be those of its father; but the perception of the foot-prints, however certain the child may be that they are those of its father, is not yet the same as finding the father by actual experience. The sorrow of doubt, and the sadness of being alone, have not yet been banished from the heart by the joyfulness of living fellowship with the father. So it is with a person as long as he has not become a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus; he has ideas or notions of God, but he has not yet found him to the joy and comfort of his heart. Upon his conscience yet hangs the burden of sin. The prodigal has not yet returned home, to the community of saints, where the Heavenly Father dwells.

When Jesus asked his disciples, "But who say ye that I am?" Simon Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answered and said unto him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed

it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It is not *Petros*, but *Petra*—ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, *upon this the rock*. By the rock Chrysostom understands "the faith of Peter's confession." This is also our view, but we would add, that this faith of Peter and his confession, must not be separated from Peter's spiritual apprehension of Christ, who stands here as the first representative and confessor of the regenerating power of the Gospel. According to the Apostle Paul, St. Peter was one of the foundation stones of this holy temple—"Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," etc. It seems best therefore to understand Christ's words to mean: "Thy name declares thee a living stone of the Rock of Ages, and upon that rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This corresponds with what St. Peter himself says: "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." This is the rock upon which the Lord's house is standing. Christ builds up his Church by dwelling in his people through faith. The material principle, the law of spiritual life in Christ Jesus, must be held in a living, spiritual organism in order to propagate itself. The Church was first in Christ. He is the nucleus around which the Church is formed. Christ himself is the grain of mustard seed. For the kingdom of heaven, or the Church, was originally inclosed in him, and from him unfolded itself, having as much oneness of life with him as the tree with the seed in which it was originally shut up, and out of which it grew. He is at once the sower, and the seed: for by a free act of his own will, he gave himself to death, whereby he became the author of life unto many; as he himself had said, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." And his field or garden in which he sowed the seed is the world; for the world was made by him, and when he came into it, he came unto his own.

The objection which our adversaries render against our Article in which we hold that the congregation of saints is the Church *invisible*, is refuted by their own illustrations. They say: "That the wicked or ungodly ought not to be separated from the Church, because John the Baptist compares the Church to a floor, on which wheat and chaff are heaped together; and because Christ compares it to a net, containing fishes, both bad and good." Yet when we look over a field of wheat, we see nothing but the blade, the stalk, and the ear, while the wheat is invisible until the harvest has come, and the wheat is thrashed, and the chaff separated from it. In the time of harvest the wheat is gathered into the barn. So also in the parable of the draw-net. When we say that it gathered of every kind, we may understand both bad and good. As the servants who were sent to invite the guests to the marriage supper, "gathered together all," as many as they found, both bad and good; so here the fishers take first, of all kinds within the folds of the net;—men of every diversity of moral character have the Gospel preached to them, and find themselves within the limits of the visible Church. But as all do not use the advantages which the communion of the Church has afforded them, an ultimate separation is necessary; and this is described in the words, "when it was full they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away." When the number of God's elect is accomplished, then the separation of the precious from the vile shall follow, of the just from the unjust. "Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous." The Fathers of the Confession, therefore, speak of the Church *invisible* and *visible*; of the Church *invisible* in the Seventh Article and of the Church *visible* in the eighth. Not two Churches, the one invisible and the other visible, but two aspects; the Church or community of saints in the field, the world, working for the conversion of sinners, with the bond of union between them, the word and the sacraments, which are used as instruments by the saints for the conversion of the world, whether it be in the visible organization or out of it. The Church is neither alone visible nor, alone invisible; but visible and invisible at the same time; for

her invisible, spiritually-born nature has a present visibility in the word and sacraments: through these the Church is manifested. In the word and sacraments, as means of grace, the spiritual treasures of the Church are deposited; here they are audible, visible, tangible, present.

The Church was born on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost generated independent faith in the disciples of Christ, who up to that time were still in a state of nonage. They were not prepared to go forth into the world as apostles until they were endowed with power from on high; for the message of the Gospel was to be a testimony or witness to the people, not of one only, but of two. Each apostle was an independent witness and the Holy Ghost was the other. "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." Christ's whole ministry was directed both by his preaching and by his miracles in working or founding faith in independent personalities, who were to be bound together in love, not in founding impersonal institutions or outward rites and ceremonies. The Church was to be a living community of free personalities; not a dead body. How the Lord rejoiced when he saw his ministry bearing fruit in the conversion of his apostles! "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father,—and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." This revelation of the Son we have in the faith of Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" for Jesus said, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Peter and his fellow-disciples through the word and Spirit began to conceive the real character of Jesus of Nazareth; a new life began to be revealed to their inner man. Christ was becoming the centre of their

inner spiritual life, as the entire body of disciples had already become an outer centre of his person, and his design was that the Church should grow out of that body. But such a Church could not exist on earth until Christ was glorified, and the Holy Ghost was given. Of this the disciples had had an intimation in that wonderful cry of Jesus in the temple at the feast of tabernacles: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this he spake of the Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" Again, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." Christ accordingly ascended into heaven, sent the promised Spirit, and formed the Church, consisting of living personalities bearing the life of Christ in them. Hence, the Church is also the temple of the Holy Ghost. But the Church's holiness does not inhere in its institutions or in things, but in free personalities. "Be ye holy; for I am holy." But notwithstanding the variety of believing personalities, the Church is one body, the pillar and ground of the truth, a historical, imperishable power, through the word and sacraments, which are not the Church in themselves, but they minister to its formation and preservation. But this one Church, which has existed on earth since the day of Pentecost, is not described in the New Testament, as in perfect harmony with the outer community of the baptized. He that believeth not shall be damned, though he be baptized. Even in the days of the apostles there were many in the visible Church, who did not belong to the true Church. Such were Simon, Ananias and Sapphira, who although baptized and in the outward community, were yet in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. They had not entered into a full realization of the import of their baptism; for if we are born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost, there must be a correlation between the outward act and the inner spiritual baptism. The bond of union, the word and the sacraments, by which they should have be-

come one with the true Church, was broken by their unbelief, and thus rendered inoperative. Christians are rather to be in the world, while not of the world, a light in the darkness, the salt of the earth, the leaven in three measures of meal, hidden but working till the whole mass is leavened. Since, then, the Church is burdened with many who belong outwardly to it, but inwardly to the world, and since it must still hold fellowship with the world, by word and sacraments, because many members are still lacking to the completeness of its body,—since, further, its individual members, although believing, are still sinful, while the Church as a whole exists not in glory, but in weakness, in lowliness that reflects the destiny of Christ, in cross and passion, it is evident that, according to the New Testament, the essential nature and the manifestation, the inner and outer side of the Church, are apparently not yet co-equal. As St. John says: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” The distinction between the Church invisible and visible, therefore, rests on biblical grounds. On earth its form is that of a servant, not triumphant; but this ought not to weaken its zeal in self-purification and growth, but to quicken such zeal because of the yearning hope it has of its certain consummation: “That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.”

The distinction, however, between the visible and the invisible Church is foreign to the first centuries of Christendom. The reason lay undoubtedly in the fact, that in those ages the Church enjoyed an essential unity and purity, to which not the least contributor was the sifting power of persecution. This exercised a most effective Church discipline. But when, after the fourth century, the heathen masses suddenly streamed into the Church, the contrast between the Church as it should be and as it actually was, began to become strikingly apparent.

But the question assumed a different phase in the age of the Reformation. The evangelical idea of faith and its inwardness contained, instead of mere communion with men and equality

in outward rites and ceremonies, immediate, personal communion with God, participation in justification through the atonement and the Holy Ghost. Herewith was also connected the certainty, that this faith must be the principle and regulator of the community deserving the name of Christian Church. In this way the evangelical teachers came in profound opposition to the Roman Catholic idea of the Church, which found the Church in the unity of cultus and ceremonies, but especially in a legal constitution of Christian confessors on the model of the State, and in the subjection of Christians to the hierarchy, in which obedience is due in God's name. Roman Catholics denied that the evangelicals belonged to the Christian Church, unless they submitted to the hierarchical decrees and the Catholic cultus. But in the material principle the evangelicals found the means both for defending their own standpoint and criticising that of their opponents. And the working out of the apologetic and polemical significance of their positive conception of faith, led to the distinction of the Church as *visible* and *invisible*. They refused to concede that they did not belong to the latter. Thus the expression Church visible and invisible gradually became current among the Reformers. Although Zwingli was the first to use it (1531), it forced itself on Luther as on Calvin and Melancthon, although they did not understand thereby two separate Churches.

Our Article therefore teaches that a person is not a member of the Church in the full sense, who merely stands in the outward communion of church usages and ceremonies, or under the same church government, but only that one who has faith; for the Church is principally a communion of faith, and of the Holy Spirit, the assembly of saints scattered over the whole earth. Since, then faith, like the Holy Spirit, is not perceptible to sense, under this aspect invisibility pertains to the Church. What is said in the fifth article of the Augsburg Confession comes here into consideration. It treats of the connection of word and sacraments on the one hand with faith, on the other with the Holy Spirit. It is accordingly laid down with logical strictness that where faith is, there are also word and sacraments, and believers gathered around the two are therewith gathered around

Christ as their common invisible Head, who is the bond of communion through the Holy Ghost. And since word and sacraments are visible, we go on to say, 'Although as to its essence the Church is not perceptible to the sense (for word and sacraments of themselves are not the Church, and still less is communion of church government the Church, which is first given in faith and the Holy Spirit), still it has outward marks by which its existence is known, not however by sense, but only by faith, as the Apostles' Creed says: "I *believe* in the holy Christian Church," which involves the truth that the Church is not only visible, but, moreover, that she is invisible, otherwise it would have sufficed to say, "I *see* the holy Christian Church."

We come now to speak, in this connection, of the means of grace, word and sacraments, as the connecting link between the Church visible and invisible. The Church invisible becomes visible through the word and sacraments. "The Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is correctly taught, and the sacraments are properly administered." According to evangelical teaching, of course, the Church is primarily "the communion of faith and of the Holy Spirit in the heart," as our Confession says. But faith demands outward means, through which it is produced and retained, and the Holy Spirit carries on this work in the souls of men only through such means, which we therefore call means of grace. As all human spiritual intercourse, and all intellectual inter-working of one with another, must be outwardly adjusted, especially through the word, in which the mind acquires its express sensible form, so the efficacy of the Holy Spirit demands also, as long as we are in the flesh, outward sensuous organs and means, through which he draws near to our souls. These efficacious means of the Holy Spirit, are the word and sacraments. Through these means the Holy Spirit conveys into our souls the rich treasures of grace and truth. We with Christ and his Apostles will therefore hold fast to word and sacraments. For the certainty of salvation is a blessed knowledge. "We know and believe the love that God hath to us. God is love. And he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the spirit which he hath

given us." God is indeed an unapproachable light: no created spirit can of itself, by its own power penetrate or interpret him, or become possessed of his mysteries; every attempt of the kind gives but an apparant knowledge. But God can certainly manifest himself to the soul that longs for true knowledge and wisdom, and in this passive state create a consciousness of his abiding presence. "For in this," says Luther, "we work nothing, we render nothing to God, but we only receive, and suffer another to work in us, that is to say, God."

How, then, does God work this true knowledge of salvation in us? The answer is found in the means of grace, the word and sacraments. The Holy Spirit makes use of outward and sensible means through which he produces and perfects the Divine life in us. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." "And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." The saints are all taught of God. Only through the means of grace can we know certainly that our justification, regeneration, and sanctification, are the work of the Holy Ghost; for through these his work is first recognized, and becomes present and tangible.

But with the conception of salvation in the heart, it is with the Christian as it is with Christianity itself. The world could by the power of the Holy Ghost conceive Christianity, but it could not of itself interpret or beget it. Christianity is a new creation of God thrown into history. So is also salvation a new work of God within our spiritual life. For as Christianity has entered as a new creative principle in the world's history, so must there also a new creative spiritual power enter into us, unite itself with us in fellowship, in order to build up our moral nature, if we would be true Christians, members of the holy Christian Church, the community of saints; for grace is not merely a doctrine, a commandment, or an exhortation, not

merely setting up an ideal, and giving us new ideas, but it renews our minds and hearts, it makes spiritual men.

Grace and truth, however, do not carry on their work without our coöperation, or without us, but they work in us to will and to do. Faith is a gift of God, but it comes to us by hearing the word of God. But this faith which is God's gift, becomes my faith by an act of my own will. This is effected as soon as the heart turns to the Lord. The veil of unbelief then drops from the soul, and grace and truth enter.

But from this act of faith, which each one has to accomplish, he cannot be delivered by another, not even by God, but he has to consummate it himself. God cannot believe for us; we must believe for ourselves. But yet all our coöperation with God, rests upon the ground, which the work of God has laid in us by word and sacrament. As salvation was a work of God in Jesus Christ without us, so is it also with the communication or reception of salvation in us. The Spirit of God comes to us, enters us, and works in our spirits by and through the word and sacraments. The word is the revelation of the Spirit of God. He speaks also to us in the rich world of symbols, but his special form in which he addresses us is the word and sacraments.

Jesus Christ is the living word, the absolute revelation of God. In him God has revealed to us his whole heart and mind. The word began to be spoken by the Lord, and all know what an inspiring power his word possesses. The same word has been confirmed to us by those who heard him. He ordained his Apostles, and endowed them with the Holy Ghost to preach the word. Ever since the day of Pentecost, the word of the Lord has sounded throughout the world.

The word is the life and power of the Church. When the German chevaliers offered their swords to Luther, in defence of his cause, the offer was warded off by the declaration, "The word shall do it."

But when is 'the Gospel correctly taught' according to our Article? It is not merely when the preacher turns out beautifully rounded sentences, to exhibit his juridical logic, grammar, rhetoric, science, eloquence, and the fertility of his imagination and the beauties of poesy—not mere *composition*, but *exposition*;

but when his preaching is the answer of the Holy Ghost to an awakened conscience, inquiring after the way of salvation, after holiness and righteousness, after the certainty of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, which formed the soul of apostolic preaching, as also that of Luther and of his work, the strength of original Protestantism, and yet forms the continual strength of its power. Whoever would have a Christianity or Protestantism, whose root is not found in the evangelical preaching of justification by faith, annihilates the truth, and destroys the future of the Church.

Preaching was the chief work of Jesus Christ. Preaching he appointed as the chief calling of his Apostles. Preaching was the office of the great prophets of the Old Testament. The religion of the Old World and her opposition to Christianity, fell before the power of preaching. It was by preaching that the banner of the cross was unfurled, by the beginning of the fourth century, over the palaces of the Caesars. It was by preaching that Luther aroused the slumbering principalities of Germany, and by preaching he alarmed the whole Catholic world. It is by preaching the pure Gospel of God, justification by faith, that a new order of things has been opened, and which is destined to overcome all opposition, even 'that man of sin' whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

But the word of God encounters us in some other forms than preaching. When the Christian mother teaches her children to pray, when she explains to them the pictures of the Bible, when the Sunday-school teacher instructs his class, when our theological professors unfold before their students the mysteries of Christian doctrines and ethics, when the pastor instructs his catechumens, all this is declaring the word in different forms. But its special form is yet the open proclamation of the Gospel through preaching. In this it concentrates its whole power, and accomplishes its great work.

Our Church therefore considers preaching as the chief thing in the service of God, and desires all who preach to be well qualified in heart and mind. The hearer may be convinced by a single word or through a long process. But in order to this

there is need of the whole word—the Law and the Gospel. Both these must accomplish their work in us, if we are to be brought to a knowledge of salvation and to a sound Christian faith. And to set forth the difference between Law and Gospel, is a fundamental doctrine of our Church. The Law serves the Gospel. The Law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. It is a moral discipline to be passed through to Christian liberty. "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." When, in obedience to the law, we endeavor to subdue and conquer ourselves, we begin to feel the contradiction of our evil tendency only strengthened. This was the experience of St. Paul in the moral discipline through which he passed in his deliverance from the law through the law. He says: "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." This is the experience of all who have passed through the moral discipline of the Law. We would, and yet cannot; we would, and yet would not; we strive to be free, and yet do not become so; we ever resolve new resolves, and yet never bring them to a consummation. "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" exclaims the Apostle Paul in that terrible lamentation in the seventh chapter of Romans, where he treats of this inner schism, and the inability of self-will over against the overwhelming power of our sinful nature. This is the experience which we all have had in this way; we have felt our deep poverty of spirit. "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." This is the end of the Law; this is as far as the Law can bring us. Here comes in the Gospel. "When the fulness of time was come," says St. Paul, "God sent forth his Son." Israel had, and the Gentile world had its time of the Law. What the Mosaic law was for Israel, the moral ideal of philosophic morality was

for the heathen world. As the time was fulfilled, God sent forth his Son: this is repeated in each individual. When the Law has accomplished its mission in him, then there is room made for the Gospel.

The Gospel, however, is Jesus Christ. He is the import of Christian preaching. But what is it to preach Jesus Christ? It is to preach the Incarnate Word, the Son of God become man, the forgiveness of sins, the comfort of the assurance of salvation. It is a proclamation of absolution to the sinner from guilt, sin, death and the devil, and an offer of eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ. When an awakened sinner receives and believes this proclamation, God counts his faith for righteousness. When we would reach the kernel of Christ's preaching, we are apt to select such texts as these: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" or, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" or, "Daughter, thy sins are forgiven." When we inquire into the kernel of apostolic preaching, St. Paul answers, "We preach Christ crucified." The Gospel is therefore a divine proclamation of reconciliation. We are to preach to the people that God is reconciled to them in Christ. Not that he will be, but that he is. God would not have created the world with the possibility of sin, if he had not been reconciled to sinners in Christ before the foundation of the world. So St. Peter: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God." The names of the saints are "written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." With this thought the Augsburg Confession is in perfect harmony, which we fear is too much overlooked by many preachers, whose offer of salvation to sinners is environed with such hard conditions, that faith cannot be awakened in their hearers. The teaching of the Augsburg Confession on this point is the

pure Gospel of God. It says: "When they believe, that they are received into favor, and that their sins are remitted for the sake of Christ." This is the Gospel of absolution proclaimed to penitent sinners, and all who believe in Christ have what is offered in the Gospel, the divine favor and the remission of sins. Out of this belief springs the new life of faith, and union with God. And when we inquire into the preaching of Luther and the fundamental doctrine of our Church, we shall find a correspondence with the apostle Paul, justification by faith, *i. e.* the experience of the forgiveness of sins and sonship through a faithful reception of the grace of God offered in the Gospel. Then the heart sings:

"Ich habe nun den Grund gefunden
Der meinen Anker ewig hält.
Wo anders als in Jesu Wunden?
Da lag er vor der Zeit der Welt:
Den Grund der unbeweglich steht
Wenn Erd und Himmel untergeht."

But this experience is attained by many Christians through manifold fallings and risings. But the word of the Lord is stronger than our weakness, and along with the word, are the sacraments, which God has ordained to sustain his working in us, and to help our weak faith.

What, then, are the sacraments, and when are they "properly administered?" The sacraments are symbolical acts. The symbol expresses a necessity of our nature. Puritanism, which knows only white walls, misapprehends human nature, and its necessities. The truth would assume a visible representation, and the word would clothe itself in the garb of visible things. Our life is interpenetrated by symbols. Why not also the religious life? The whole cultus is a symbol. When symbols fail religion becomes bald and cold. The sacraments, which are Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are fulfilled symbols. They rest on divine institution and ordination of Christ, for the time during which we are separated from him; and we believe what they symbolize, they also contain and communicate. They are truly means of grace.

Before Jesus departed from his disciples, he instituted Chris-

tian baptism, as the act through which all those, who become willing, should be received into the number of his disciples. Baptism is therefore the sacrament of initiation. By baptism we are to be received into the fellowship of the triune God and his salvation. The central point, however, is the atonement made by Jesus Christ, the forgiveness of sins. Baptism signifies the purification from sin; not merely that we shall purify ourselves, but that God shall purify us. Grace is offered in baptism, and received by faith. The object of baptism is to affiliate us with God, and the bond of union for this is the Holy Ghost. Baptism is therefore the covenant of a good conscience with God (1 Pet. 3 : 21).

Baptism with us Lutherans has mostly become infant baptism. The children that are born in the Church, are her children, and they are received into covenant relation with God through baptism. In the Acts of the Apostles we are informed that St. Paul baptized whole households. Our children, it is true, are not conscious when they are baptized; for their whole spiritual life is yet in an unconscious state out of which it only grows and develops by degrees. But yet it is there, and of such is the kingdom of heaven. Should they not therefore be dedicated to the Saviour? For Jesus said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Why then should we not bring our children to Jesus, and why should we not be assured that he will receive them, and grant them his blessing? Baptism is the expression for this.

If our children even have no knowledge of what takes place in their baptism, does it follow therefore that nothing whatever transpires in them internally? For the beginning of our spiritual life lies far beyond our understanding or comprehension. Be assured that God has his work in the infant as well as in the adult. But this the communion of our baptized children with God is yet to become a matter of personal experience and life. We permit therefore confirmation to follow baptism; not in order to make baptism more complete; not in order to renew it; but that the baptized himself assume that on which he has been baptized, and that he express it with his own mouth; that the

covenant of God in his baptism be also a covenant of his understanding and will; and that he receive at once the blessing during the years of his moral development and his spiritual experience. With confirmation we combine the beginning of the Lord's Supper, and herewith the entrance into full communion with the Christian Church.

In commemoration of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, upon the evening of the Passover, the same night in which he was betrayed, when he had given thanks, Jesus took bread and brake it, and said: "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me (1 Cor. 11 : 24, 25)." So spake the Lord, and this is what he has bequeathed to his Church. And so has Christendom observed it in all times. During all its history the Church has regarded the Lord's Supper as the highest of all its transactions, as the very mystery of mysteries itself, and has always believed, according to the words of the Master, to have received in this the body and blood of the Lord. Therefore in the form of the celebration in the ancient Church, the minister during the distribution of the elements, said to the communicant: "The body of Christ;" "the blood of Christ!" and the recipient answered with "Amen!" But it is true, in what sense the sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, there is dispute. The feast of fellowship has become the sign of separation.

The Roman Catholic Church suffers the earthly element to be absorbed in the heavenly; it is wonderfully transformed through the consecration of an ordained priest. It is no more bread and wine; it only appears to be bread and wine; in truth it is only the flesh and blood of Christ. The Reformed Church leaves the earthly elements mere signs and coverings of an inner spiritual fellowship of believers with Christ; it is only spiritual communion with Christ and the merits of his death. The Evangelical Lutheran Church believes that the words of Christ are to be taken as they read, and as St. Paul understands them, when he says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not

the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" That is to say: "The partaking of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, is a partaking of the body and blood of Christ."

The Holy Supper is the last legacy of the departed Lord. Whether we fully understand it or not, the chief thing is that we should receive with humble and believing hearts, what is here given unto us, and that the blessings, which are herein extended unto us, should follow. The Lord's Supper is a legacy of love; and the nature of love is to give itself. We must therefore understand the nature of love, the personified love, which is Christ himself, who is truly present and received, if we would fully understand the Lord's Supper.

III. *The True Unity of the Church.*—"And for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments." This our Church itself has found somewhat difficult to do, nevertheless it has given us the true principle by which we should be guided to the consummation of this blessed end, viz: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." The principle of true unity runs through all these points to guide us in our discussion. Let us follow this principle "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

In discussing this point of our Article, we must ascertain the standpoint of the Fathers, which we discover in the Apology,
VOL. XXIII. No. 3. 42

where Melancthon says: "Our adversaries also condemn that part of the seventh article, in which we say, that it is sufficient for the unity of the Church, to agree in the Gospel and in the administration of the sacraments, and that human ordinances need not everywhere be uniform. This they grant, so far as to say, that the unity of the Church does not require special traditions concerning rites and ceremonies to be alike; but they maintain, that the true unity of the Church calls for uniformity in general or universal traditions."

"This is a most awkward distinction. We say that those are one church who believe in one Christ, and have one Gospel, one Spirit, one faith, and the same sacraments; we are therefore speaking of *spiritual* unity, without which, faith and a Christian character cannot exist. This unity, then, we say, does not require human ordinances, whether universal or particular, to be everywhere alike. For righteousness before God, which is brought by faith, does not depend on external ceremonies, or human ordinances, and faith is a light in the heart, which renovates and quickens it. To this work, external ordinances and ceremonies, whether universal or particular, contribute little or nothing." Our Fathers here again have the advantage of their adversaries by holding fast to the Apostolic principle, or the law of spiritual life in Christ Jesus, which animates the body of Christ, and holds all the parts in unity. It is *spiritual* unity which our Fathers advocate as 'the true unity of the Church.'

If the true unity of the Church is a *spiritual* unity, it must necessarily be sought in the Church *invisible*; for in the Church *visible* there never can be true or perfect unity in this world. "I believe in the community of saints," a society of Christian people having common ecclesiastical rights, privileges, and interests, and holding the Bible as their only infallible rule of faith and practice, and such confessions of faith as are in harmony with the word and sacraments, but as long as we are the Church militant, we will have our imperfections and different judgments. For they are not barely diversified dogmas in which the churches distinguish themselves from one another; they are totally diversified aspects, which have given them their stamp. As long as this diversification stands, all outward union is vain, and only

an occasion to strife and separation. So great a universal historical matter of fact as the division of the Church, rests not on mere misunderstandings, and is not settled by merely good resolutions. It is, indeed, to us a sorrowful wrong. But this wrong should be endured patiently, and the union for which we hope should be prayed for. For the unity of the Spirit is the bond of peace. And this division of the Church must also serve the divine purpose. For however painful to our souls, that the assembly of Jesus Christ should be torn asunder into diversified churches, yet we do know, that each church has her peculiar gift with which she is to work in building up the Kingdom of God; and each is to serve the other with the gift which she has received. But wherever we find a Christian, there we know that we have laid hold of a child of God, a brother in Christ, an heir of salvation. And we delight ourselves in the unity of spirit and of faith, notwithstanding the diversity, until it shall please the Lord to bring us into full communion of spirit and harmonious thought. But, until then, we will travel the way the Lord has given us, and follow the lamp which lights our path. This lamp on our way is the Holy Scripture."* The final victory of the saints, however, will come, when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and when this mortal shall have put on immortality. Yet there is a true spiritual unity in the Church invisible, which admits of cultivation and development. The experience of one Christian is substantially that of another, and the true and hearty prayer of one receives a response or amen in the heart of another. True unity is the ideal which ever seeks to be realized. This ideal may approximate realization through and by means of all that is good in the diversified denominations into which the Christian Church is divided; for Christ has prayed, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Therefore let us be strong in faith, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, continuing instant in prayer. And in the Church of the future, it will not be the least part of our joy and blessedness, that our beloved Zion has held fast to

*QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. III., page 70

the fundamental principle of word and sacraments; for in order to the fulfillment of Christ's prayer for unity I do not believe that all must assume the name of Lutheran, or Reformed, or Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist, or any other merely denominational distinction, but that the Church will ultimately find its consummation in, with and by these diversified names, which after all are merely accidental or conventional. Neither do I believe that by endeavoring to build up my own Church I thereby destroy Christian unity, but just the reverse; for I thereby endeavor, if I am actuated by the right spirit, to convert men, not to a merely accidental name, but to Christ who is the true ideal of all Christian excellence.

When therefore the unity of the Church is spoken of in the New Testament, it is a spiritual or moral unity which is intended. The import of this is, that all who worship God according to doctrine of Jesus Christ, should regard themselves as members of the holy Christian Church, the community of saints, and as such should exercise mutual brotherly love; that notwithstanding all differences of birth, condition, knowledge, opinions, and forms, they should still constitute one brotherhood, worship one and the same Lord, even Christ, and be partakers in common of the promised Spirit. That there should be such a union among his followers was the last will and testament of Christ. "As I have loved you, that ye also love one another." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." In order to this, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments.

But there gradually arose, after the second and third century, an entirely different conception of the unity of the Church. It was placed on an entirely external agreement as to those doctrines and forms which were handed down from the times of the Apostles, through the Churches founded by them, and in the external connection and fellowship of the particular societies founded upon this agreement.

The most ancient passages relating to this subject are found in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Irenaeus (A. D. 120-202) says: "As I have already observed, the Church, having received this preaching and this faith, although scattered throughout the

whole world, yet, as if occupying but one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these points of doctrine just as if she had but one soul, and one and the same heart, and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed only one mouth. For, although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the traditions is one and the same."* Thus Tertullian (A. D. 145-220) also says: "The apostles founded churches in every city, from which all other churches, one after another, derived the tradition of the faith, and the seeds of doctrine, and are every day deriving them, that they may become churches. Indeed, it is on this account only that they will be able to deem themselves apostolic, as being the offspring of apostolic churches. Every sort of thing must necessarily revert to its original for its classification. Therefore the Churches, although they are so many and so great, comprise but one primitive Church, founded by the apostles, from which they all spring. In this they all are primitive, and all are apostolic, whilst they all are proved to be one, in unbroken unity, by their peaceful communion, and title of brotherhood, and bond of hospitality,—privileges which no other rule directs than the one tradition of the self-same mystery."† Again, Cyprian (A. D. 200-258) finds the true unity of the Church in the universal episcopal *cathedra*, like Moses' seat in the Church of the Hebrews. This one chair is called St. Peter's chair. "And this unity," says Cyprian, "we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided."‡

Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian thus evidently make the true unity of the Church consist in rites and ceremonies, or in universal traditions, and this in the Church visible, and the object contemplated in this external connection of Churches was at first very good; it was designed by this means to set limitations to the ever encroaching corruption of doctrine and life, and to remove false teachers. But when the rulers of Churches

*Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., p. 331.

†Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. III., p. 252.

‡Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V., p. 422.

no longer possessed the spirit of Jesus, then, through these principles and the consequence derived from them, the hierarchy was gradually established; and intolerance and the spirit of persecution and anathematizing became very prevalent. Even the papal hierarchy rests entirely upon these principles, and originated from them. The principal bishops now established a kind of college or secret society; and this unity of the Church was made dependent, first, upon many bishops, then, upon *one visible* head of the Church. And whoever ventured to dissent from the doctrine or the ordinances of the principal bishops, was excluded from Church-fellowship and declared a heretic.

How, then, is true Christian unity promoted? It may be promoted by each Church attending to the work which God has assigned it. Proselytism is destructive of true Christian unity. It is condemned by the Lord Jesus Christ, where he says, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." It is seldom that a person converted from one denomination to another becomes a better man. He may have more zeal for the Church to which he has been proselyted than for the one from which he has been abducted, but his zeal is often without knowledge. He has been converted to a mere accident or mode of operation in Church polity, which may be scripturally and philosophically inferior to the one which he has abandoned. So it is this day with many poor abducted Lutherans. There is such a thing as losing Christ by changing from one denomination to another, not that every denomination of Christians does not in some measure apprehend Christ, but because the heart and mind may be taken up more with merely denominational peculiarities than with Christ the hope of glory. It was thus that the Galatian Christian lost Christ, to whom St. Paul writes thus: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" The great ma-

jority of denominational differences are at any rate merely carnal notions of the true Church, and for this reason they must necessarily fall away in the consummation of true Christian unity. Many of these denominational differences are as detrimental to true faith as were the peculiarities of the Judaizing Christian teachers in Galatia. The Galatians were converted to Christ by the preaching of the Gospel; and the truth which they obeyed was that man is justified by faith alone without the deeds of the law. Thus they had received the promised Spirit through faith. But Judaizing teachers coming among them, taught them that unless they would become circumcised and keep the law of Moses, they could not be saved. And many followed these pernicious teachers, and thus they lost Christ.

Thus it is with many persons who are proselyted from one denomination to another. Losing sight of the pure Gospel, they are persuaded that unless they subject themselves to certain rites and ceremonies instituted by men they cannot be saved; as the mode of baptism once backwards or three times face foremost under water, feet-washing as a sacrament to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church, the holy kiss of charity, episcopacy with its figment of apostolic succession, a peculiar costume of dress to be distinguished from the world, etc. Many have thus become entangled again with the yoke of bondage, and have turned the Gospel of the grace of God into a most rigorous law, into a system of human commandments, and the loving Saviour, the friend of sinners, into a stern and inflexible judge.

This brings us to notice, in the next place, that pure confession of faith, and diligent use of the means of grace, promote true Christian unity. It is thus that the Church invisible expresses her truth and love visibly. It is thus that she sets her light on a candlestick, that all who enter may see the light. "For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest; neither any thing hid, that shall not be known and come abroad." Although invisible, the Church has no disposition to hide her treasures of knowledge, but ever seeks to make all her mysteries known and come abroad. And this is her mission in the world.

- To this end confessions of faith should be clear and true statements of Christian doctrines, convictions and duties, and should be heartily accepted and diligently practiced as such, by those who promulgate them. "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."

Where there is therefore no clear and true statement of Christian doctrine, conviction, and duty, there can be no true Christian life or unity. If the convictions and creeds be wrong, they ought to be corrected by clearer and truer interpretations of the word of God. Consequently it has been said: "We receive and hold, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession, as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word." The only ambiguous word in this statement is the word *fundamental*. Does it mean that some of the statements in the Augsburg Confession, are not fundamental and therefore need not be received, or practiced; or, does it limit the fundamentals in God's word to those only mentioned in the Confession, so many and no more? The ambiguous word might be omitted.

Much has been said and written against creeds, but what is a creed but the summary of the convictions of what is received and believed in the Church to the end of true Christian unity? What is the Augsburg Confession but what is received and believed as the Christian convictions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church? We have not much respect for those persons who are always endeavoring to adjust the Augsburg Confession to their own notions. Of course, there is room for honest differences, if they spring from superior knowledge of the Scriptures. "Nevertheless, whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." The Augsburg Confession is a good light to go by amid the breakers, rocks and quicksands of modern skepticism. Whoever observes this light,

drawn from the source of all light, and keeps it in his heart, as he sails over the sea of life, will most assuredly at length stand on the crystal shore with those who have gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, having the harps of God, and singing the Song of Moses, and the Song of the Lamb, saying, "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints."

We affirm that we have a correct statement of Christian doctrines, convictions and duties in the Augsburg Confession. For what is the Augsburg Confession but a confession of the truth, and of the convictions of the faith and of the ethics of a truly Christian life? For the Confession was designed to set forth over against Roman traditionalism, the Christian doctrines, convictions and duties, which enter more specifically into the ethics of a truly Christian life. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church is a progression from one degree of faith to another in Scripture doctrine and spiritual life. This is what our Confession advocates. We become lights of the world as the glorious principle of the Reformation and of primitive Christianity manifests itself in our lives.

The Protestants had strong convictions of Christian doctrines and duties, because they discovered clear and strong Scriptural statements of these in the preaching and writings of the Reformers; and thus they united in the Augsburg Confession to combine their work in a true Gospel unity. When the Elector of Saxony was making ready to sign it, Melanchthon interfered, saying, "It is for the theologians and ministers to propose these things, whilst the authority of the mighty ones of the earth is to be reserved for other matters." "God forbid," replied the Elector, "that you should exclude me. I am resolved to do my duty without being troubled about my crown. I desire to confess the Lord. My electoral hat and my robes are not so precious to me as the cross of Jesus Christ." And so saying, he wrote down his name to the immortal document, JOHN, ELECTOR OF SAXONY. GEORGE, Margrave of Brandenburg; ERNEST, Duke of Luneburg; and PHILIP, Landgrave of Hesse, followed

his example. A fifth took up the pen, saying, "If the honor of our Lord Jesus requires it, I am ready to leave my goods and life behind me ;" and wrote his name WOLFGANG, Prince of Anhalt. "Rather would I renounce my subject and states," said he, "rather would I quit the country of my fathers, staff in hand; rather would I gain my bread by cleaning the shoes of foreigners than to receive any other doctrine than that which is contained in this Confession."* The men of those days were men of faith, conviction and daring. We will therefore hold fast to this Confession of confessions until the Church furnishes us with a better. Our acceptance of it should be hearty, and our practice of it diligent.

The Augsburg Confession, which was adopted in 1530, holds together in true Christian unity, as well as any other confession has ever held the Church visible, no less than fifty millions of professing Christians in different parts of the world. It is also ample enough in its dimensions and strong enough in its basis (for it is founded upon the Rock of Ages), to hold in true unity the whole body of Christ, which is the holy Christian Church.

IV. Our next point is *the Cultus of the Church*.—The Christian Church has been established to introduce the whole human family into the public worship and service of God. "Ye are the light of the world." The purport of divine worship is to render us acceptable to God. To this end the Jews brought thank-offerings and sin-offerings. Nevertheless, the Jewish worship was only a shadow of Christian worship. The Christian Church is rendered worthy through faith in the blood of Jesus. "Having, therefore, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he has consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh ; and having a high priest over the house of God ; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering ; for he is faithful that promised ; and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works : not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is ; but exhort-

*Ecclesia Lutherana, p. 51.

ing one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching." "For the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness: fear before him, all the earth." There is no truth standing out more clearly on the consciousness of the assembly of saints than the fact that they cannot render themselves worthy as worshipers in the presence of God by any strength or merit of their own. Therefore they come to worship more for the purpose of receiving the divine blessings and gifts than for the purpose of rendering God service. The first feeling therefore, that arises in the heart of the Christian worshiper is humility on account of personal unworthiness. He takes his shoes from off his feet, and falls down before the Divine Majesty, and cries, *unclean!* UNCLEAN!! When this is done in spirit and in truth, the Lord comes and lays his right hand upon us, saying, "Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forever more, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Sin renders us unworthy in the divine presence, but faith in Christ renders us as worthy as the angels who never sinned. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Therefore it becomes Christian worshipers to be clothed with humility. "For God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time: casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you."

A scripture Cultus should therefore possess these elements:

1. It should contain an acknowledgment of the presence of the Triune God;
2. A sincere confession of sins;
3. A hearty expression of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ for divine mercy;
4. Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs;
5. Thank-offerings for the support of public worship and for the extension of God's kingdom;
6. A space for the patient hearing of the word for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness;
7. A renewal of our covenant with God in the use of the

sacraments; 8. Dismissal with the Old or New Testament benediction by the minister.

The Lutheran idea of Christian worship is sacramental; it is more a receiving from God than a rendering to him. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church is not a mere negation of the errors of Rome; but she is the repository of grace and truth, which she seeks to express and reflect in her confession and cultus. Should she cease to do this, she would cease to be the Evangelical Lutheran Church. "No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light." "Ye shall be my witnesses"—with this commission, word and sacraments, the Lord has sent the Evangelical Lutheran Church into the world to call the nations to personal salvation, and to gather his congregation of saints. Jesus must be accepted by faith which changes the heart; for in the question of the certainty of salvation the Lutheran Church has its root. Without this faith there can be no true Christian worship. The word must be preached, experienced, professed, sung, prayed, in its purity, to reach the hearts of sinners, in order to awaken the response of evangelical faith in their souls, into which also Christ may come and abide, and set up his kingdom, a kingdom of truth and love. For this evangelical faith generates a new mind and a new heart, out of which there comes spontaneous Christian worship. For before the sinner embraces the Saviour in the arms of an appropriating faith, there is a controversy between him and his Maker. He is an enemy of God and a child of wrath. All the feelings of his unrenewed nature are arrayed against God, and all the divine perfections are arrayed against him. But when he is united to Christ by faith, there is a change both in his inner and his outer life. The enmity of his heart is slain; the rebellion of his will is subdued. His peace is made with God; he is reconciled with his Maker. Everything has now become new, and in accord with God. He loves what God loves; and he hates what God hates. His views, his feelings, his purposes, his prospects and his character are all changed. He enters into the Church of Christ, into a new community of peace and good-will. Sinai's terms are all

over and gone. The tidings are carried to the world above, and saints and angels rejoice over the repenting and believing sinner. What makes this peace so precious and gracious is the fact that it is settled upon the foundation of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone. It is purchased by Christ's death, inspired and sealed by his Spirit. How the possession of this peace sweetens the bitter cup of life and brightens the darkest valley of death-shades! How it also sweetens the dying hour, and causes the Christian to exult and triumph amid the solemnities of the last closing scene!

Out of such experience flows all true Christian worship with its preaching, its confessions, its hymns, its spiritual songs, its prayers, its alms, its benedictions, and its amens.

The earliest account of Christian worship is given in Acts 2 : 41, 42, where it is said : "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized : and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and prayers." In this brief statement we find all the elements of Christian worship ; the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, the fellowship of believers, prayers, and a holy life.

The importance of the Cultus of the Church cannot be easily overestimated. It is the expression in worship of the Church's faith and life, and bears a confessional character. It is also an important means of propagating the faith and life of the Church.

The forms and order of public worship are not therefore, in every sense, things indifferent. No one beyond the Romish pale, presumes that they are absolutely necessary to salvation, as they exist at any particular time. Our article guards against this error. According to this the greatest variety might possibly exist in the same Church and with the same faith. Nevertheless the Lutheran Church has not been indifferent as to its forms of worship. Such passages as the following in the old church regulations were never suspected of a departure from the spirit of Lutheranism, viz.: "Although the Christian Church is not built upon the uniform order of ceremonies, but upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, which is our Saviour

Jesus Christ, and upon his holy divine word, yet, as God is not a God of confusion, but of peace, and desires that all things should be done decently in the congregation and that unity should be sought, there can be no doubt that the adoption and preparation of uniform, spiritual useful ceremonies, so far as possible, is a service highly acceptable to his eternal Divine Majesty, which, apart from the many other purposes of utility which it subserves, tends to preserve the unity in his doctrine and to prevent many offences to the common man, who observes the external ceremonies and judges the doctrines, sacraments, and the whole ministerial office by them. Therefore, the prescribed order in hymns, lessons and ceremonies shall be observed in our churches. And where it has hitherto not been done, the pastors shall be governed by this regulation; they shall not, without weighty reasons, depart from it, but in free Christian charity subject themselves, that strifes and offences among the people may be avoided. No one shall be allowed arbitrarily to oppose this order, or make alterations according to his own pleasure."* Consequently, the form of public worship in the Lutheran Church, is not altogether a matter of indifference. The confession and faith of the Church must manifest itself in some form; for without a Cultus she cannot exist. In form of worship she should stand in an organic relation to herself. If the genius of our Church were not evident in its parts and their arrangement, then it would not be matter of great importance what form were used. But her Cultus is an expression of her principles and faith. She reformed the old Cultus as she did the old doctrines. She proves all things, and holds fast what is good. This conservative, historical principle manifests itself in her order of public worship, or at least should do so. The question is not therefore whether the Evangelical Lutheran Church will have a liturgy; for she has never been without one in all her varied history. If her churches in America have gotten somewhat away from her old landmarks, and the modern tendency is to return to her pure forms, we ought rather to rejoice to see this trend of things. The Common Service is before us, for aught we know to the contrary, the best Lutheran order of service that has so

*EV. REVIEW, Vol. IV. p. 526.

far been offered to our English Lutheran Churches in America. If any thing better can be produced, let it be brought forward and let the whole Church adopt it.

The Common Service is brief, which is a settled characteristic of a Lutheran order of service. It is also Scriptural, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. For he says: "After this manner therefore pray ye, 'Our Father,'" etc. 'Ye' means the Church. It is a formula for public as well as for private worship. It is thus, also, that the Apostolic Church prayed in the language of the second Psalm. "They lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things," etc. Jesus also prayed in the language of the Psalmist, when he said on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Again, the Common Service is Lutheran. When we say that it is Lutheran, we mean to say that it is in harmony, as far as we can judge from the facts presented, with our grand Lutheran doctrines and Cultus. The Lutheran Church has her own peculiar conceptions of justification by faith, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. These doctrines lie in the heart of the Church, and they must find some expression in public worship. They produce a joyful service. The spirit of our doctrines therefore ought to run through all our public worship, for this is the life of the Church. This life is to be perpetuated by public worship. In our transition from German to English, during a period in which Puritanism was dominant in our land, it is remarkable that any of our Lutheran features should at all have remained. If we give up altogether our distinguishing features as a Church in our public worship, we shall soon be without our grand Apostolic Lutheran Church. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto thee."

Where, also, will you find a greater variety, in any order of service that has ever appeared before the English Lutheran Church in America than what is found in the Common Ser-

vise? There is a different introit and collect for every Sunday in the whole church year. The introits are all pure Scripture, and the collects are based upon the Epistle and Gospel for the day. For what are the Scriptures read in our churches, if not to put us in the right frame of heart and mind for prayerful worship? But what prayers are more appropriate, in general, than those drawn from the lessons for the day? Besides, there are forms of prayer for all occasions, for the secret chamber, for the family altar, and for our public festivals. These prayers are the expression of true worship. If the Spirit be wanting, it must be in the worshiper. These prayers, like the Hebrew, are all consonants, unless the spiritual vowels of prayer are breathed into them by the worshipers. An unbeliever or a formal Christian can never pray nor understand these prayers; for no one can say from his heart that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. If there had not been a holy Christian Church in past generations, we should not be in possession of such rich prayers. The true Christian spirit alone can appreciate and appropriate them.

Moreover, the Common Service is devotional. Any one who will carefully read and study it will be convinced of this fact. But a devotional spirit can be cultivated by using the thoughts, language, and spirit of the Church, all drawn out of God's word, and infused with the spirit of grace. We have in the Common Service in general the forms in which the Church has prayed and worshiped during many generations. Shall we discard the form and spirit of devotion in which the pious have worshiped in past centuries? Do we not still belong to the community of saints? Being compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside our slipshod forms, which we have imbibed from other quarters, and let us return with our children into our glorious Lutheran service.

Besides, it is most liberal in its demands. It is willing to stand on its own merits. Neither ministers nor congregations are compelled to use it all or in part, if they find that circumstances are adverse to its introduction. But it is still a satisfaction for us to know that we have a pure form of Lutheran worship, even if we do not elect to use it. It is not to be presumed

that the Lutheran Church in this country, after she has wandered about in the Puritan desert for so many years, should at once find her way back into her own beautiful fields of rich pasture. But she is moving towards home, having at length become conscious of herself.

Further, the language and thoughts of the Common Service are beautiful and perspicuous. There is no ambiguous word in the whole work, except that a few obsolete words, which are still found in the Authorized Version, are retained. But even these have an ancient flavor about them which is truly refreshing. We seem by these to be in communion with the ancients, and to be worshiping with them. The prayer for those who are in bonds has been misunderstood by some, but on a little reflection it must be seen to be a most excellent prayer; for there are many Christians in bonds throughout the whole world, and the Gospel of Christ is most assuredly also to enter our prisons and dungeons, and to bring light and comfort to suffering humanity. But incorrigible criminals, for the sake of law and order, must be punished. For this we must also pray, as is proved by the Psalms in many places.

The service is, also, educational. We must all endeavor to work up to a higher standard. If our people in this generation cannot all reach this higher standard, we must not think that future generations will be unable to attain to this excellency; for the future congregations of the Lord will be much more intelligent than the present. What with our numerous colleges, our excellent theological seminaries, our advancing Sunday-schools, our Christian Endeavor movements, our parochial schools, and our glorious common schools, with our universities and university extension, the coming generations of the holy Christian Church shall look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners. The church of the future will be moderately liturgical—the Evangelical Lutheran Church in her best state. This is most certainly true.

The great objection made against the Common Service is that its introduction into our churches would lead to formality in

worship. The same objection could be raised against any form, and without some form we could not conduct public worship. The form of worship, which God ordained in the ancient Church, was glorious, and at length the Jewish worship fell into formality, but this was not caused by God's prescribed form, but by wicked hearts through which all things sacred are perverted. The Jews had a form of knowledge and of the truth in the law, but why did they not find the truth? The answer is at hand, because they sought it not by faith, but by works. But the holy Christian Church has not only a form of grace and truth in the word and sacraments, but she has already experienced grace and truth through our Lord Jesus Christ, whom she meets every time she comes to worship, and who is the content of her faith. Shall also all other denominations have their peculiar forms of worship by which they are distinguished, and shall we as Lutherans be asked to give up or abandon our most beautiful service? Let us hold fast our own inheritance, and let not another take our crown of Glory, which many are coveting. Facts show that where our churches have been most faithful to our confession and cultus, there we find the greatest church activity.

Others suppose that the Common Service would not be in harmony with the spirit of revivals and modern progress. In reply we would say, were not Luther, Arndt, Spener, Francke, and Muhlenberg, in true harmony with the spirit of the Gospel or revivals? But they were also firm adherents to our Lutheran confession and cultus.

We have now discussed the Perpetuity, the Essential Nature, the True Unity, and the Cultus of the Church. We still have need of further study in "the infallible rule of faith and practice," for clearer apprehensions of grace and truth, in order that we may be in deeper living fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ, without whose personal presence with us and in us, all our confessions and cultus become as 'sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.'

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

ARTICLE II.

THE CHURCH.

By REV. JNO. BRUBAKER, A. M., Wrightsville, Pa.

The Church is a most important fact in the world, and occupies a prominent place in Christian doctrine. There are many passages of Scripture that indicate its nature and design. In the Apostles' Creed we say that we believe in "the holy Christian Church." The doctrine concerning the Church is part of our Christian faith, and should receive its proper share of attention.

We cannot think of Christianity apart from the Church. The two are inseparably associated. Sometimes we meet with persons who pretend to be friendly to Christianity, but not to the Church. They profess to believe that the Church is not necessary to religion; but, as Dr. Luthardt says, "This is a delusion, if not hypocrisy; for the Church is the body of Christianity, and Christianity is her soul. We cannot be in favor of Christianity, if we be not in favor of the Church."

The Church is a divine institution. It is "the Church of the living God." It is not a mere human society, but a divine creation, a work of the Holy Spirit. The Christian Church had its origin on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit, sent by the Son from the Father, rested upon each of the disciples, and united them by a new inner spiritual bond. Christ had previously declared that he would build his Church upon the rock of his divinity, and his apostles, in their writings, speak of the Church as his Church and his body, of which he is the head. According to his promise it would ever have his presence and protection. He appointed for it a ministry and instituted the holy sacraments to be observed in it, and furnished his Gospel to be taught and preached by it.

The Church is therefore a divine creation. It was established by the power and authority of Christ as the instrumentality for conveying the blessings of his grace to men. It was purchased

by his blood. He is its foundation stone and its head. It must not be lightly regarded, but should be held in the high honor to which its divine origin and character entitle it. To oppose the Church is to oppose Christ and Christianity. It is to go contrary to God's command. The Church bears the seal of the divine image and superscription. It is holy. It has come from the living God. It belongs to him. It partakes of his nature. It works out his righteous and gracious purposes. It is entirely distinct and different from all human societies and organizations; for it is of God's founding, and he is intimately identified with it, and watches over and preserves it.

In the language of our Confession, "the Church is the congregation of the saints (or believers), in which the Gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments are properly administered."

It consists of an inner spiritual element, and of an external visible organization; and hence we are accustomed to speak of the visible and invisible Church, by which we refer, not to two distinct churches, but to the one Church of Christ. At the same time there are persons, who, according to Christ's own teaching and that of his apostles, are externally connected with the Church, but do not partake of its inner spiritual nature. All who profess faith in Christ and receive the sacraments are members of the visible Church; but not all such are united to Christ by a true and saving faith, and have been renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

While recognizing the high and superior importance of the spiritual and invisible element in the Church, we also see the necessity of an outward visible organization. It is only thus that the Church can accomplish its mission in the world. The successful teaching and preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, the conduct of public worship and the appointment of church officers require that Christ's followers shall be associated in an organized capacity. To think that such outward organization is not necessary to the existence of the Church, or that we can be members of the invisible Church apart from such external relation with Christ and his people, is not in keeping with the clear facts of scriptural teaching.

We notice, also, that the Church, in all its communions and

branches, is one. It is marked by an essential unity of spirit and of faith. The true followers of Christ are one spiritual body of which he is the Head. This body is constituted of all regenerated souls of all denominations. There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and in you all" The true unity of the Church does not require entire agreement of opinion on all questions of scriptural doctrine, or the same ecclesiastical usage. It does not require uniformity in the mode of worship, or church government, or in the observance of any human rites and ceremonies. In matters of worship and government the New Testament furnishes us general principles for our guidance without defining any minute system for our use, thus allowing considerable liberty of choice.

Under existing circumstances it is natural that there should be differences of view in regard to scriptural teaching on some points, and such differences of opinion have given rise to various particular branches of the Church; but this condition of affairs, within certain limits, is not inconsistent with the proper unity of the Church. In fact this diversity is the basis of unity, just as in music the best and most harmonious effect is produced, not by sameness of sound, but by variety and difference of sound. There are many illustrations of the principle of unity in diversity. It is eminently characteristic of the world of nature in which we have a great variety and complexity of parts, and yet a profound and beautiful unity. And so, too, we recognize the unity, the oneness of the human family, although it exists under much diversity of condition. We find different races, different languages, different customs, different development, and yet there is a common bond of unity. The various denominations of the Church may differ in a number of respects, but each one may nevertheless be a branch of the true vine, and draw its real essential life from Christ. While men are permitted to think for themselves, we cannot expect to see a sameness of opinion and practice in matters of religion any more than in other things, and it is better that it should not be so; for such uniformity, which does not constitute true unity, would interfere with the efficiency and usefulness of the Church. But this truth must also be recognized in this connection, that there is such a

thing as unnecessary multiplication of denominational organizations, such a thing as schismatic division, which is sinful and harmful and unjustifiable.

The Church is the appointed guardian and dispenser of the means of grace. It is not infallible. It is liable to err; is not free from evil; is capable of a higher and better development and life; and is destined to attain to a more perfect character. But it is alone through its instrumentality that man can be saved. To it are entrusted heavenly treasures. It has received the divine commission to proclaim the gospel and administer the sacraments. The Holy Spirit has been given to the Church, and his work of regeneration and sanctification is wrought in the Church and through it by the means of grace which it dispenses. "Out of the Christian Church, where the gospel does not exert its influence, there is no forgiveness of sin, and consequently there can be no holiness."

From this we see the necessity and importance of church membership. Since it is alone through the instrumentality of the Church that the means of grace are rendered efficacious, we must seek salvation in the Church in both her visible and invisible capacity; not that the Church saves us, but because she is the divinely chosen and appointed instrumentality in the matter. The nature of the case demands that where there is true heart and life union with Christ by faith, there must also be "actual formal connection with the organized congregation of believers;" for, as has been truly said, "Whoever of his own choice, refuses to unite with the Church in her visible organization, cannot belong to her invisible and essential communion." Such a refusal involves a disregard of the command of Christ, and indicates a lack of saving faith.

In several respects the Church is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It is a living witness to Christ and his revelation. Its origin and continued existence bear testimony to the truth of the New Testament Scriptures. How could we account for the Church, if the events narrated in the gospels, which gave rise to the Church, did not occur? How would the observance of Washington's birthday have been introduced and established, if he had never lived and accomplished the work he did? The

fact that such observance now exists, and that we can trace it back to the time when there were those still to be found who had personal acquaintance with him, and were eye-witnesses of scenes in which he had a part, is proof of the authenticity of the accounts that have reached us concerning him. If he had not lived and exhibited the character that history attributes to him, his birthday would not be celebrated as it is. So, too, we have before us the fact of the Christian Church which is widely established in the world. We can trace its history back almost nineteen centuries. Before that date it is known that it did not exist. From that time to the present the Christian world has celebrated the birth and death of its founder, and therefore we say that the origin and continued existence of the Church witness to Christ and the revelation which he made; for had he not come and taught as the New Testament asserts he did, we should not have the Church that bears his name. It is not rational to suppose that such an institution rests on a myth or a delusion.

The relation of the Church to the truth is further seen in the power for good which she has had in the world. "Take out all the elements which Christ and his followers have contributed to the story of nineteen centuries, and you will blot out at least two-thirds of that story." Compare the condition of the world when Christ made his appearance with what it is to-day, and you will see what a wonderful change has been wrought through the transforming power of his Gospel as proclaimed by the Church. To blot out the history of Christianity and the Church, while it would remove the abuses and corruptions and evil influences which sprung from a perversion of Christian truth, would also destroy all that is noblest and best in the past and present, and that has done most for human progress and welfare. The Gospel of Christ, which the Church bears to the world, has been the chief and controlling factor in promoting the spiritual, moral, social, and material good of man. It delivers from vicious and degrading influences and practices. It nourishes all virtues and graces. It leads the way in all that makes for the progress and elevation of the individual and society. It gives hope and inspiration for this life and for that which is to come.

The Church is also "the pillar and ground of the truth" in the sense that she must earnestly and faithfully declare and maintain and illustrate the truth of Christ, and endeavor to have it prevail in the highest degree, and to the widest extent. All her members have an obligation and responsibility laid upon them in this matter. They are to be examples of the truth which they profess. They are to interpret and reflect its power and beauty in their daily lives. They are to let their light shine that others may be won to Christ. They are to aid by the consecration of their talents and the diligent use of their opportunities in Christian service, in spreading a knowledge of the gospel in the world. The Church has received the heavenly treasure of God's word to employ it for the promotion of human good and the divine glory, and she is true to her character and mission in proportion as she devotes her powers and energies to these high and noble ends.

As "the Church of the living God," she is destined to abide forever. Her security and perpetuity are assured. The gates of hell shall not prevail against her. She has met with much opposition, but she has endured and prospered; and from what she has accomplished and withstood, we may infer her future triumph. Her remarkable career partakes of the character of the miraculous, and is a pledge of the continued fulfillment of Christ's prophecy in regard to her security and permanent duration. "At times," says Dr. Luthardt, "it has seemed as if the evil deeds of her children must destroy her, but she has been more powerful than the sins and crimes of her unworthy representatives. The spirit of negativism has opposed her and appeared victorious, but she has repulsed the attacks of unbelief. She has oftentimes been pronounced dead, yet still she lives. So long as fourteen hundred years ago, in the time of Augustine, it was said that she was expiring; but to-day finds her yet alive. In the age of Voltaire and Frederick II. her decease was expected; but when the name of Voltaire is forgotten, she will yet exist. At first she was reproached for her youth, now for her age, but she possesses an eternal youth. She seems to have been thrust aside by the intellectual progress going on in the world; but when the wonderful progress of our age shall have made the

whole earth one great city of the human race, it will be seen that men have only been preparing a place for the Church. 'Wondrous, unparalleled, nay divine is it,' exclaims Pascal, 'that this Church, which is ever being attacked, has ever endured.' " She will abide forever, and it is a great and blessed thing to have part and lot in "the Church of the living God."

ARTICLE III.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

By PROF. S. F. BRECKENRIDGE, D. D., Springfield, Ohio.

Criticism of the sacred Scriptures is of two distinct kinds. They differ in matter, method and purpose. They are called by different names,—textual criticism and historical criticism.

The ideal object of textual criticism, is by a comparison of extant manuscripts of the New Testament, to restore its text to the very form of words which dropped from the pen of its authors. It may be said to have begun with the publication in 1516 of the first edition of the New Testament edited by Erasmus. Since that time very valuable manuscripts have been discovered, the necessary critical apparatus has been enormously enlarged, and the method of criticism has been conducted with such scientific rigor, that one is justified in saying, that with an inconsiderable number of exceptions, and for all practical purposes, the ideal object of textual criticism, namely a pure text, has been achieved. Compared with what has already been done, very little remains for textual criticism to do, so far as the New Testament is concerned.

The purpose of historical criticism is very different. It aims by means of internal and external evidence to answer, as far as possible with each of the books contained in the Bible, such questions as these: Who wrote the book? Are its contents history, or poetry, or prophecy, or some combination of history, poetry, and prophecy? When was it written? Where was it written? For what purpose was it written? What, if any,

were the author's sources, and did he have any supernatural aid in composing it,—in other words, was he inspired? This list, though not exhaustive, is, I think, a fairly good summary of the problems which historical criticism attempts to solve. A discussion of these questions and the conclusions reached is usually termed Introduction to the Bible.

Within a few years a new phrase has come into use, and has very largely supplanted the old and familiar name, historical criticism, namely, the higher criticism. At first the titles historical criticism and the higher criticism were nearly, if not altogether, synonymous. Probably the student regards them as still being practically synonymous. As *he* looks at the matter, historical criticism and the higher criticism have precisely the same problems to solve and precisely the same means of reaching a solution. But however that may be, in the popular mind, the term higher criticism has come to be associated with an assault upon the Old Testament Scriptures which have overthrown or are believed by some to have overthrown the traditional view of the origin and the inerrancy of the Bible. And it is upon this phase of the higher criticism I have been requested to read an essay on this occasion. But I will confine myself to such an examination as I can make in the time allotted to me, of the results of the higher criticism so far as they affect the Pentateuch in general, and then more particularly to the book of Genesis.

The theory of the higher critics had its origin in Germany. So far as I am acquainted with the facts, I should say no American scholars have done much noteworthy original work in this field of investigation. What literature we have on the subject has been for the most part imported from Germany.

The traditional view of the origin of the Pentateuch is, that Moses an inspired prophet of God composed each of its five books, with the exception probably of a few interpolations, and the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records his death and burial. It is agreed by all parties that this traditional view is not less than about twenty-two centuries old. According to the critics, the traditional view cannot be much older than this, since, as they affirm, the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was not in existence until sometime between 444 and 280 years before Christ.

Prior to that time, what we now call the Pentateuch circulated in three, and for a part of the time in four, separate, distinct, and independent documents. These documents have been woven together into a narrative, forming the Pentateuch. As a consequence these separate documents have received the convenient name of strands.

The first of these strands came into existence 800 years before Christ,—that is 651 years after the death of Moses. This strand of the Pentateuch is called the narrative of the Jehovist,—so called on account of the writer's preference to Yahweh as the name of God. For the sake of brevity it is symbolized by the letter J.

The second strand made its appearance fifty years later. It is called the narrative of the Elohist, from the writers supposed predilection for Elohim as the name of God. It is symbolized by the letter E. These two strands after circulating for a time independently, and after having been subjected to various modifications, were twisted together into a single narrative by an editor, or to use the term ordinarily employed, by a redactor, who is as completely unknown as the Jehovist or the Elohist.

About 621 years before Christ, and during the reign of Josiah, there appeared the third element which enters into the composition of the Pentateuch. It is a part of what we now call the book of Deuteronomy. It is the book of the Law of God, found by Hilkiah the high priest in the temple, of which an account is given in the twenty-second chapter of Second Kings. This third contribution to the Pentateuch should not be likened to a strand. It would be better to liken it to a pebble in a piece of conglomerate. Like the second chapter of Macaulay's history of England, dealing with the social and moral condition of the people at the time his history begins, it may be lifted out of the Pentateuch without marring its continuity. But there now appears a second editor or redactor who, after writing an appendix and introduction to the book of the law of God found by the high priest, incorporated it with the Jehovistic and Elohist narratives in such way that the additions of the editors and the three component parts seem to constitute a single narrative.

Finally, during the Babylonish captivity, Ezekiel inaugurated the new system of a written law. This was enlarged upon by we know not whom, probably by Ezra the scribe. At all events Ezra "introduced it as the constitution of the post-exilic hierarchical state."* This document called the Priests' Code, was published by Ezra about 444 years before Christ. Sometime between this date and the appearance of the Septuagint version (about 280 B. C.), a "final redactor," united the Priests' Code with the previous compilation, making the Pentateuch a cord of four strands. The Jehovistic and Elohist narratives and the Priests' Code are closely welded together all through the Pentateuch and onward through the book of Joshua, with the exception that no part of the Priests' Code appears in Deuteronomy. That is made up of the two narratives, J and E, and the book of the law of God found by Hilkiah during Josiah's reign, together with the introduction, appendix and other additions of the redactor. Thus the Pentateuch is a compilation of four separate and distinct documents, and has existed as we now have it twenty-two or twenty-three hundred years. Of course the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship sprang into existence with the conclusion of the final redactor's work. It is generally admitted, however, that as each of the four contributors to the Pentateuch had his sources, it is possible that a small, a very small, part of it may have come from the hand of Moses.

Such then in brief is the theory of the higher critics concerning the origin of the Pentateuch. The theory, one may be sure, is supported by pertinent facts and cogent reasoning. The critics cannot be answered with a sneer. They are fine scholars and dialecticians, and nothing but a scholarship and a logic equal to theirs can cope with them.

Into their facts and reasoning I shall not enter. Time forbids, even were I an expert, which I do not profess to be. But any one may weigh a certain argument which the critics present with much confidence, because they regard it as having great weight, and yet one which a layman may apprehend and upon which he is invited to pass judgment. Into this I venture to enter.

*Bacon's *Genesis of Genesis*. p. 66.

The theory of the composition of the Pentateuch which I have set forth, having been propounded, the next obvious step would be to extricate, if possible, the several strands and set them distinctly apart, each by itself. The attempt to effect such an analysis has been made. Though the critics, who may be divided into two or three schools, do not agree precisely in their analysis, they do so very nearly. Their results have been published, and are now, in their turn, open to criticism. In this country a book entitled the *Genesis of Genesis*, by Leonard Wisner Bacon, has been brought out by the Student Publishing Company of Hartford, Connecticut. The first part is introductory. The second part is the book of Genesis, in which the contributions of the Jehovistic and Elohist narratives, of the Priests' Code, and the additions of the several redactors are distinguished by impressions made by different fonts of type. The third part is made up of the separate and original narratives which the compiler used. From these all the interpolations of the redactors have been excluded.

I think it must be conceded that each of these extricated narratives, although contradicting each other at many points, forms a continuous self-consistent whole. And yet one qualification should accompany this concession. It is this: there are here and there in all the extricated narratives lacunae, quite considerable in number in the aggregate, which the critics indicate by a parenthesis enclosing either a dotted line or a conjectural reading. At these points the continuity is broken. The critics explain these lapses by the theory that the redactors when weaving the three strands into one found it necessary to omit a portion of each.

The book to which I have referred,—the *Genesis of Genesis*,—does not enter into the minutiae of the higher criticism. It is intended for popular circulation. The reader is challenged to decide for himself, by means of the results of the criticism, whether the theory of composite origin of the book of Genesis be true. The author quite evidently thinks the reader who goes through his book, and perceives the undeniable, self-evident fact that Genesis has been divided into three separate, distinct, self-consistent narratives, will be forced to conclude that Genesis is

a compilation of those narratives. The argument of the book when compressed into a syllogism, appears to me to be as follows:

Major premise: Any writing which can be decomposed into two or more continuous and self-consistent narratives, is a compilation of those narratives.

Minor premise: The book of Genesis can be decomposed into three such narratives.

Conclusion: Therefore: the book of Genesis is a compilation of the narratives into which it has been separated.

This reasoning, as it seems to me, so far as its form is concerned, is altogether sound. That is, the premises being granted, the conclusion inevitably follows. Let us therefore examine the premises. As to the minor, that the book of Genesis can be divided into three separate, self-consistent narratives, I think it must be conceded. Almost the whole of Mr. Bacon's book is devoted to the establishment of this minor premise, and, I am ready to say, for my part, and with the qualification already mentioned concerning certain lacunae, he has been entirely successful.

Let us examine the major premise, namely, Any writing which can be decomposed into two or more continuous and self-consistent narratives, is a compilation of those narratives.

I am not prepared to concede the truth of this proposition, for the reason that, as I affirm, there are many writings which no one deems a compilation which can be decomposed into several continuous and self-consistent narratives. For example: I have lately been re-reading Knight's popular History of England. For my part, I am quite certain that a strand could be extricated from that history which, taken by itself, might quite well be named A History of English Literature. Another might be separated and quite appropriately denominated A History of the Christian Church in England. Another could be disentangled which would recount the history of the English colonies. Another, of her civil and foreign wars. Another, of the progress of the English people in the fine and useful arts, and the effects thereby produced on their social condition.

In like manner, Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War might be made to yield a strand exhibiting the manners and

customs of the Gauls, another those of the Germans, and another still of the Britons. A fourth strand might be extricated which would set forth Cæsar's military operations in Gaul, Germany and Britain. Again, if the last chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans be omitted, I believe that no one has charged a composite origin against that document. And yet I have read somewhere that a certain Mr. McRealsham has done with that great piece of literature precisely what the higher critics have done with Genesis. In an attempt at analysis of this sort, say of Cæsar's Commentaries, the portions which would refuse to come into any one of the several strands might be relegated to the redactor, as the device by which he welded the several narratives into one. And if the connection of the paragraphs of the several extricated strands appear somewhat abrupt, the hiatus might be filled with brackets inclosing a dotted line to indicate a probable omission by the redactor, and occasionally one might even venture a conjectural reading.

Cæsar was a scholar, a politician, a keen observer, a soldier and a historian. That he should write such a book as his Commentaries is entirely consistent with these various offices; and that is true though it may be divided into several continuous and self-consistent narratives.

If Moses was acquainted with all the learning of the Egyptians, if he was the liberator of an enslaved people, if he was a legislator, the founder of religious institutions, a soldier, a historian and a prophet of God as the writings attributed to him by the traditional view, either assert or imply, the Pentateuch is, as it seems to me, altogether the sort of book Moses would of necessity write. And this is quite true though, like Cæsar's commentaries, it may be analyzed into several continuous and self-consistent narratives. The argument of Mr. Bacon's book is therefore futile. The major premise proves too much. It is not true. When the reader lays down Mr. Bacon's book, he is, so far as this argument avails anything, precisely where he was when he took it up. The minor premise of the book is probably true. Its major premise, if I have apprehended it correctly, is not true.

But now suppose that the conclusion, namely, that the book

of Genesis is a compilation of the narratives into which it has been decomposed, may be proved from other additional considerations. What then shall we say of its Mosaic authorship? It seems to me that the traditional view remains intact. We shall merely say, Moses had his sources which he employed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. As bearing upon this, I may here repeat that the separate narratives are at many points contradictory, each of the other. But, as woven together, the contradictory features disappear, and can only be made to appear contradictory by severe straining. Of course, the supposition that Moses compiled the Pentateuch at least in part and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, assumes that the documents employed were extant in his time. This the higher critics will not concede. According to them the oldest of these documents did not appear until 650 years after the death of Moses, the next older fifty years afterward,—the next 830 years after and the Priests' Code not until more than 1000 years after the death of Moses. Let us concede these dates for the moment and trace the consequences. The question at once arises, How did it happen that the Pentateuch was attributed to Moses? That it was attributed to him is a fact,—and a fact which presses for explanation quite as much as any other fact connected with the criticism. The traditional theory is here, and it has been with us for twenty-two centuries. How did it originate? I cannot go into details. If time allowed me I think I could show that in the last analysis there remains but one answer. It is this: for more than two thousand years the Jewish and Christian world have been the victims of a shameful fraud in which Ezra and Nehemiah took a conscious part.

Several other questions press for an answer.

1. What has become of the original documents which the redactors welded into one, and which have now been restored by the art of the critics? The answer is, they are lost.

2. Then a second question arises: Why is it that in all the field of ancient literature no allusion is found concerning them? This is not likely if they once existed as independent documents. There was recovered a few years ago a lost document,—I refer to the teaching of the twelve Apostles. Within a very short

time the Gospel of Peter has been recovered. But scholars knew that at one time they existed. And so there are, I may say, hundreds of lost writings mentioned or alluded to in writings which have come down to us. But here are four documents which have played a larger part in moulding the destinies of the civilized world than any other four documents which can be mentioned save the four Gospels, which as units are irrecoverably lost, and not once alluded to in ancient literature.

I call attention in the next place to the redactors.

1. Sometimes the redactor appears quite stupid. For example: Both the Priests' Code and the Jehovist narrative contain an account of creation. These, regarded as separate and independent records, are contradictory. No art of exegesis can harmonize them, yet the redactor has placed these two accounts in juxtaposition.* He could scarcely have known that his readers would have regarded the second account as an amplification and filling up of details in the second account. As a matter of fact they have generally done so, but he could not have known that.

2. In the next place I notice that the redactor was an immoral man. He changed the documents from which he was making a compilation in matters vital to the truth. We are familiar with the story of Abraham's servant traveling to Padan Aram to procure a wife among his own kindred for his son Isaac. The servant brought back the willing Rebecca, and according to the narrative as we have it in the compilation Isaac took Rebecca for his wife and "was comforted after his *mother's* death." Now according to the critics the document originally read, Isaac was comforted after his *father's* death. But the redactor deliberately, with a conscious knowledge of what he was doing, and for a purpose changed father to mother. He had two reasons for doing this. He had taken out of its proper place Abraham's marriage to his second wife Ketura and had placed it immediately after the account of Isaac's marriage to Rebecca. As this would have married Abraham after his death, the redactor for harmonistic purposes, changed father to mother. A second reason was that he wished to incorporate in his compilation the ac-

*Genesis in colors, by Prof. Edw. Cone Bissell.

count of Abraham's death given in the Priests' Code. But as he also wished to include the Jehovahists' account of Isaac's marriage which casually mentioned his father's death, as a consequence he was forced to prevaricate, and so at this point, like a writer of fiction, he killed the character most convenient for his literary purpose. The only possible excuse for the redactor is that he knew that he was dealing with the myths, legends and folk-lore of a barbarous people, and it was not of the least consequence whether the wolf suckled Romulus, or Romulus suckled the wolf. It was not so anyhow.

I will cite one other case in which the redactor, to use our strong Saxon word, lied. You know the story of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt. He had been driven there in consequence of a famine. And there he had introduced his wife as his sister. Equally familiar is the story of Isaac's sojourn in Philistia, being driven there also by a famine. There he, like his father in Egypt, passed off his wife as his sister. Now according to the higher critics these two stories are a twofold account of the same legend. And doubtless that is true if we accept their theory of compilation. The redactor must have known this, in fact the critics say he did. And yet he inserts a clause which clearly makes two separate and distinct events out of one. He introduces the story of Isaac and Abimelech, King of Gerar, with these words, "And there was a famine in the land." This is taken from the Jehovistic narrative, but the redactor immediately adds on his own responsibility, "Besides the first famine which was in the days of Abraham." This was added for harmonistic purposes, but it was untrue. There are other more flagrant cases than these two. Certainly, taking the analysis as submitted, it is impossible to place any confidence in the moral fibre of the redactor. Indeed, the critics themselves speak disparagingly of him. But this is not more than he deserves in view of the shameful deceit he has practiced on all the Jews and us Gentiles.

When I began my ministry I was somewhat sensitive. If I observed a would-be auditor sleeping in his pew I was considerably unnerved. I was wont, however, to console myself with the reflection that a young man in ancient Troas went to sleep

and fell out of a window while the great Apostle to the Gentiles was proclaiming the Gospel. I find a somewhat similar satisfaction in reflecting that although this redactor has deceived me all my life, and all my ancestors as well, for I know not how far back, he also deceived St. Paul in a very important matter.

One of the greatest writings of the apostle is his letter to the Galatian churches. It was the main scriptural weapon of Luther in his terrific grapple with Rome. Of it he said, it is my Epistle, to it I am married. Its main doctrinal theme is justification by faith alone, apart from the deeds of the law. This doctrine the apostle supports with much vehemence of language, cogent reasoning and great wealth of illustration taken for the most part from the Old Testament Scriptures. In the 3rd chapter and eighth verse the apostle says, "And the Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." And in the 16th verse he continues, "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken and to his seed, he saith not to seeds as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed," and then the apostle makes a very weighty announcement, saying, "which seed is Christ." A comparison of the Hebrew, the Septuagint version and the original of the epistle makes it apparent that St. Paul had in view the following passages: Genesis 18 : 18 and 22 : 18. The first of these with context reads as follows: "And Yahweh said shall I hide from Abraham that which I do: seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of Yahweh to do justice and judgment; to the end that Yahweh may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

The second passage with context reads as follows: "And the angel of Yahweh called unto Abraham a second time out of heaven, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith Yahweh, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as

the sand which is upon the sea shore ; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies ; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

Now neither of these passages which I have read forms a part of any one of the three narratives from which Genesis was compiled. They are rejected by the critics as the unauthorized additions of the redactor. They have become merely the worthless solder by which he welded the narratives into one whole. Notice also his audacity. He introduces his own matter, what is purely his own invention, with the words, "And Yahweh said," "And the angel of Yahweh called unto Abraham a second time out of heaven and said," and he does not hesitate to make a promise in God's name which the apostle interprets of Christ. And so St. Paul, thinking as a matter of course that he was quoting from the sacred writings of Moses to fortify the great doctrine of justification by faith,—a doctrine which has twice turned the world upside down—was really quoting from the invention of an unknown, stupid, immoral, and audacious forger of the name of God ! Yes, the redactor has deceived you and me, but he deceived an apostle ! who declares that he received the Gospel, not from men as the source, or through man as the channel of communication, but by direct revelation of Jesus Christ.

Not only St. Paul believed the Pentateuch to have been composed by Moses writing under divine inspiration, but all the apostles as well as all the Jewish rabbis of their time believed it. Moses was a personage so great in the eyes of the Jews, that the writer of Hebrews, in order to exalt the person of Christ, shows that our Lord, the mediator of the new, was greater than Moses the mediator of the old covenant. But under the handling of the critics Moses becomes a myth.

Moreover, our Lord was mistaken. Time does not permit me to particularize. I will only say that any one reading the four gospels with a view of detecting his mistakes, will find scores upon scores of instances, mounting up into the hundreds, in which it is immediately or indirectly implied that he accepted the traditional view of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

When the criticism of the higher critics is in turn subjected to criticism, they *all* maintain their irenic spirit up to this point.

But here, so far as I have observed, signs of irritation on the part of some are noticeable. But the greater number continue to be amiable. They are independent spirits, able, too, by a logical process, to push their theories to remote consequences. These blandly reply: "Oh, yes, that follows of course. Our Lord, like all his contemporaries, was deceived, just as until lately all the Jewish and Christian world were deceived for twenty-two centuries." I admire their candor, their courage and their logical prowess. They go promptly and willingly where their theories inexorably drive them. But there is another though smaller class that become restive at this point. They employ such terms as "narrow," "bigoted," "stupid," and "ignorant," when the critics of their criticism show or attempt to show that their theories involve a denial of the Christian view of the person of Christ. They are such as are still clinging to the verges of orthodoxy, but with a grip so nerveless that every moment seems to threaten them with precipitation into the abyss of unbelief. Possibly the reason of their irritation may be found in the fact,—at least I may say I think it to be the fact,—that all the considerations by which they seek to avoid the conclusion pressed upon them and which their bolder, less orthodox and more advanced brethren blandly and cheerfully admit, imply the very thing charged and which they wish to escape, namely, sinking the person and work of Christ to the level of a merely human teacher. From this as yet they shrink. The forces of their early education are still being asserted. To this, however, their bolder associates in this work have already come, and to this conclusion the pupils of these halting teachers will inevitably go. Jesus is not the eternal Son of God who became flesh, by whom, through whom and for whom all things were made and without whom was not made anything that was made. That is all a mistake. He is a man and nothing more. He must take his place, doubtless the first place among such teachers as Plato, Confucius, Zoroaster, Mahomet and other great teachers of morals. The ideas of atonement for sin, justification by faith, resurrection of Christ and intercession at the right hand of God, must be given up. Indeed, the whole fabric of Christian theology built up during nineteen centuries disap-

appears like the exhalation of a night before the morning sun. The Christian religion, thought to be unique in that it is a revealed religion, revealed from heaven to man through the goodness of God by inspired prophets and apostles, is, like all other religions, of human origin and carries with it only the sanctions with which what is called the religious consciousness may endow it. Under this criticism the Bible disappears as a revelation of God. The only revelation he has made of himself is such as we may doubtfully gather from human history. The Old Testament is the record of Israel's apprehension of God's character and of his disposition towards men so far as they could apprehend him from the course of history. In other words it is a photograph of the religious consciousness of Israel, just as the Koran exhibits the religious consciousness of Islam, or the Rig-vedas the religious consciousness of the Hindoos. In like manner the New Testament is the record of a similar apprehension of the Christian consciousness. But as to either Testament being an authority, that must be tested by each man for himself. He must determine that by his own individual religious consciousness. It is not a "Thus saith the Lord," but what saith the religious consciousness. But it is a superstition to suppose they have any binding authority as a direct revelation of God. They have no such authority. Thirty centuries ago have no right to bind twenty centuries ago, and twenty centuries ago have no right to bind the century in which we live. As the centuries long since past made their own Bible, so we will make ours. We refuse to be in bondage to an effete past. Such then is the final logical outcome of the higher criticism, based on the assumption that the several narratives which have been compounded into one called the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, came into existence at the periods assigned to them by this criticism.

A word or two concerning the future and I have done.

For the present the higher critics have the floor. Their work is thoroughly destructive of all that the Christian world has held precious for nineteen centuries. Whilst not faltering in their conviction of the truths of revelation, and that the Bible comes from God, multitudes of Christian people, of the laity, of the pulpit and of the theological chair, seem stricken with dismay.

I venture a prediction based on two bits of history, which I will briefly, very briefly, recite.

When Lessing published the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, between 1774 and 1778, he produced an intense commotion.

The theory of one of these fragments is that the object of Jesus was "to reform Judaism, and in defiance of Roman power to establish an earthly Messiahship. Only when this plan had failed, when the designer of it had perished on the cross, did the disciples give" his life and death "a spiritual signification," and then they invented the story of the resurrection. They were engaged in "a secret plot" to impose an untruthful story upon the world. First amazement, then consternation, and finally panic, was the result produced by the publication of these fragments; but long before the century closed the theory was abandoned in every quarter.

The other bit of history to which I ask your attention, belongs to our own century. I refer to the Tübingen school and its theory of the origin of the books of the New Testament. It is that only the two Epistles to the Corinthians and the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans are genuine. Most of the remaining books came into existence late in the second century and constituted a theology mediating between two violent and bitterly hostile parties in the Christian Church denominated respectively Pauline and Petrine parties. Frederick Christian Baur invented this theory and supported it with an industry rarely paralleled, and by a learning never surpassed. Again alarm, dismay and panic followed each other. But there also followed a period of research into the history of the primitive Church which resulted in placing weapons in the hands of the orthodox so formidable that the theory of the Tübingen school, as is everywhere, has been decisively and unambiguously repulsed all along the line. On the other hand, the last word of historical criticism of the New Testament, as announced by Bernhard Weiss of the University of Berlin, a scholar quite as independent as Baur, substantially restores the traditional view of the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the New Testament, and of the dates at which they respectively appeared.

The critics, as I have already remarked have the floor. The

last word has not yet been said. Viewing the past, then, may I not predict, without assuming the air of a prophet, that at least the young men here of this audience will live to see the day when the traditional theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch will be re-established, all the more firmly because of the rude shaking to which it has been subjected. I feel that such will be the case and that the Bible of our fathers and our Bible will be the Bible of our children and of our children's children. So may it be, for it is only "with the conviction that the writers of the Scriptures throughout were inspired men, and spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, we have a power demanded alike by the cravings of the soul, and the aspirations of the intellect."* Only under such conviction is it that when there come before us the awful questionings of the heart, questionings prompted by the longing for immortality, questionings concerning the all-embracing future, we can find strong consolation in the hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor of the soul and that entereth into that within the veil.

ARTICLE IV.

THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

By G. U. WENNER, D. D., New York, N. Y.

The term "Power of the Keys" is taken from Matthew 16: 19, where Christ says to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Gerlach suggests that the figure is that of unlocking a fetter or chain. Just as fetters bind the body, so sin and guilt bind the soul. But the generally accepted explanation is that it is the figure of a householder or steward. Thus in Isaiah 22: 22, it is said of Eliakim, "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall

*Bishop J. F. Hurst.

open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open."

To the steward belongs the power of binding and loosing, that is of shutting and opening. As the representative of his Master, whatever he does is valid. Steitz, in Herzog, points out the antithesis between the words "bind" and "loose," and claims that it is upon this antithesis that the emphasis must be placed, and not on the acts themselves. Whatever he does as his Master's agent holds good, even though his acts are as far removed from any opposed to each other as opening and shutting. The question therefore as to the precise meaning of "binding" and "loosing" is one of minor importance. "Forbid" and "allow" are suggested by Lightfoot and Steitz, from rabbinical usage, and these terms very properly describe the duties of a steward. The general conclusion is that it is not simply a two-fold, but a comprehensive power. Says Bengel: (*Gnomon*, Mt. 16 : 19) "By the expressions, therefore, of binding and loosing are comprehended all those things which Peter performed in virtue of the name of Jesus Christ, and through faith in that name, by his apostolic authority, by teaching, convincing, exhorting, forbidding, permitting, consoling, remitting; by healing, by raising from the dead, by punishing. In Acts 15 : 8, Peter himself records an instance of a matter performed on earth and sanctioned in heaven.

That which is stated enigmatically in Mt. 16, the disciples not yet being able to understand its mystery, is afterwards thus expressed: (*John* 20 : 22 ff.) "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose-soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose-soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

From this passage, and also from Mt. 18 : 18, it is clear that this power was not conferred upon Peter personally, but only as the senior and representative of the apostles, who with the prophets constitute the foundation of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone, (*Eph.* 2 : 20) So far as it related to him alone, it was manifested in the results of his pentecostal sermon. And it was Peter who was sent to Cornelius, and who thus first opened the door to the Gentile converts.

But in Mt. 18 : 18, where this power is specifically conferred upon the whole body of the apostles, the context shows that it belongs to the congregation of believers, *i. e.*, the Church. Just as in the Old Testament the Levitical priesthood rested upon the basis of the universal priesthood : "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation," (Ex. 19 : 6,) so in the New Testament is it true that all Christians are invested with priestly attributes. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," (1 Peter 2 : 9.)

In this Power of the Keys is indicated the means by which the forgiveness of sins is effectually applied to the individual soul. Of what value were all the gifts of salvation, if the sin-burdened conscience could not be assured of its own personal interest in that salvation? The feast may indeed be prepared, but if we have to look at it from the outside and through grated windows, it cannot feed us. Hence Christ, who took away the sins of the world, when he was upon earth repeatedly pronounced an absolution or remission of sins upon certain individuals. And this he did not in his divine capacity, but as the Son of man, who had power on earth to forgive sins, and in refutation of his enemies who claimed that none but God could forgive sins. This power was afterward delegated to the apostles and through them, as we have seen, to the whole Church.

In a wider sense preaching, that is the public declaration of the Law and the Gospel, is an exercise of this power. And in the nature of the case the admission to or exclusion from membership in the Church belongs to it. These have been universally recognized, and to many minds at the present time they are the only ways in which this power can legitimately be exercised. In contending against certain errors and abuses which early associated themselves with the doctrine, and which in later times assumed proportions so destructive to spirituality and the truly Christian life, a large part of the Church has gone to an opposite extreme, and by ignoring one of its most precious privileges has finally lost an important function of the Christian ministry. I refer to that distinctive power of the keys known as absolution.

It is hard to understand why a doctrine with such a clear

scriptural basis, and in such complete harmony with the redemptive mission of Christianity should not have had a normal development in the history of the Church. One of the earliest tendencies in the wrong direction, partly as an offset to the Montanistic heresy, was the confining of the power to the episcopal office. In Cyprian's time the Church was only the physician whose duty it was to prescribe the medicine for the sin-sick soul, although he also maintains that outside of the Church there can be no salvation. But with Leo the Great the idea begins to prevail that without the intercession of the priest there can be no salvation. This view was also held by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century and was adopted by the Council of Trent in 1551. The theory that without confession there can be no forgiveness, paved the way for the torture of the confessional, that probing for all possible or impossible sins which must be confessed before a valid and perfect absolution can be obtained. The extension of the power to temporal matters thus making it an instrument of oppression instead of a means of grace, further characterizes its use in the Roman Church.

It was left to the great revival of apostolical Christianity in the 16th century to clear away the rubbish that had accumulated around this institution. Zwingli utterly repudiated the traditional interpretation of the power of the keys and confined it to the social sphere of the Church, the power of admitting and excluding members. Calvin held the same view except that he also included preaching.

The Lutheran theologians, on the other hand, while retaining the old forms, gave to them as it were a regeneration. To them absolution was nothing less than the word of God which must be believed as truly as if it were a voice from heaven. Ordinarily it was pronounced by the minister, not as a priestly mediator, but as a minister of the Church deriving his authority from Christ, indirectly through the Church. But it might and should also on occasion be pronounced by any Christian brother.

It differed from preaching in that it was a direct application to the individual soul of the promises of the Gospel. It was not made conditional upon repentance, but was absolute and unconditional. Repentance was a condition only in so far that there

could be no faith without repentance. But neither is faith the condition on the ground of which absolution is conferred. It was only the hand that received the gift. And the weakest faith received it just as truly as the strongest faith. The minister was only called upon to decide whether the applicant for absolution was sincerely seeking his soul's salvation. If he was a hypocrite, the absolution was ineffectual but not invalid. There happened as Christ said, "If the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it be not worthy let your peace return unto you." The case is illustrated by the figure of the sun that melts the wax but hardens the clay. Where excommunication was declared, the object was not destruction but rather the salvation of the individual, according to 1 Cor. 5 : 5, "that the spirit may be saved."

As an institution it was conceded to be of human origin. That is, the form which it had assumed was not prescribed by the word of God.

Nevertheless in Melancthon's *Apologia* it is classed among the sacraments.

Its object was to bring consolation to anxious consciences, and for this reason its use was highly commended. The practice of confessing before partaking of the Lord's Supper was retained. Nevertheless it was not made obligatory upon all. Luther said that he would not insist on it in the case of Master Philip and other ripe Christians. He says of himself that he went to the Lord's Table on several occasions without having confessed, although such was not his usual custom. He did it, he said, to spite the devil, and also because he was not at the time conscious of having committed any gross sin. Nor was it necessary to enumerate particular sins. It was enough to confess sin in general, and if the penitent chose to do so, to enumerate one or two instances. For the plain people, and for the young, a simple form of confession was suggested. The decline of the institution in the Lutheran Church may be ascribed to that general decline of religion which took place after the Thirty Years' War. It was handled in a perfunctory and unspiritual way. The connection of the Church with the State placed the work of church discipline in the hands of the latter, so that it assumed

the form rather of a police regulation. Pietism attacked the confessional vigorously. Pastor Schade in Berlin led the attack with the watchwords *Beichtstuhl—Hoellenpfuhl*, which may be freely translated Stool of Contrition—Pool of Perdition. Spener retained its distinctive character by requiring communicants to come to a personal interview with him before communion. During the eighteenth century the confessional was still retained to a large extent, but under the influence of rationalism and the declining feeling of guilt and the need of forgiveness, it eventually ceased to be a general institution of the Church.

The practice now is to hold a preparatory service, at which a general confession is used and the communicants are called upon as a congregation to answer certain questions, whereupon a general absolution is pronounced. Communicants are however urged to make known their special spiritual difficulties to their pastors, and, when it is desired, absolution is pronounced.

The Anglican Church evidently recognizes the importance of the institution. In the exhortation giving notice of the celebration of the communion, the minister invites those who may be specially burdened in their conscience, to come to him in order that they may receive the benefit of absolution. In the canons and homilies provision is also made for confession and absolution. The Prayer Book, however, provides for it only in the case of the visitation of the sick, excluding the statement of Edward the Sixth's book that the same form is to be used in all private confessions, and adding parenthetically since 1661 that it is to be used provided the sick person humbly and heartily desires it. There are two other places where the term absolution is used in connection with certain forms, after the confession used at morning and evening prayers, and at the communion. But a close examination of the language shows that it is a misnomer, or at least is not used in any historical and accepted sense. In the former case the minister correctly states the scriptural authority, and just when the people are ready to hear him exercise that authority, and are anticipating an authoritative statement, he disappoints them by making a simple doctrinal statement which no one can deny, viz., that God absolves those that truly repent, and concludes by inviting the congrega-

tion to unite with him in a prayer that God may grant unto them true repentance. It is evident here that the minister has awakened expectations which he shrinks from fulfilling. In the communion, also, the term absolution is used, but still less has it here any connection with the words that follow. For these words, after stating that God has promised forgiveness under certain conditions simply contain a wish or prayer that God might have mercy upon them and pardon and deliver them. It is clear, therefore, that the Church of England, with its magnificent heritage of antiquity, was unable to withstand that radical spirit of the Reformation which preferred to put away everything that reminded of Rome, rather than to prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

It seems therefore that while an important part of Protestantism has rejected the doctrine of absolution altogether, others, which have retained the theory, have been unable to make much practical use of it. Nevertheless there are reasons why we should not lose sight of it. Some of the greatest minds along the whole line of Christian history have used it and approved of it. If it is indeed one of the gifts which Christ has given unto men, and the exegetical grounds for this are strong, we may be sure that its use will not perish.

But there are also psychological and moral reasons which commend it to us. It answers a need of the human soul. Pascal says: "Men often come to a true knowledge of their sin and are able to make a right resolution to reform only after they have confessed their faults not only to God but also to men."

"The most appropriate means of self-abasement," says Rothe, "is a confidential exposure of one's sins to others. Such confessions are decisive victories over our self-love and the false shame connected therewith. In many cases they are the indispensable condition of moral healing." "How many sins there are," says Harless, "which it is absolutely necessary for men to confess before they can be freed from them. As long as we conceal them they are as it were bound up with our very selves and control us."

And Luther: "Not for the treasures of the whole world would I give up the privilege of private confession, for I know what

strength and comfort I have derived from it. Nobody knows what it can do until he has fought and contended with the devil: I would long since have been overcome and destroyed, if this confession had not sustained me."

In our age such expressions seem to be exaggerated and uncalled for. But no one can doubt the masculine and truly spiritual character of Luther's experience.

Perhaps a picture from home-life will help us to understand it. If your child has offended against you during the day, you would not like to have him to go to sleep before he had confessed and obtained your forgiveness. It would be dangerous to his soul to do so. It was after David had confessed his sin to Nathan and had received absolution, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin," that he was able to write the 51st Psalm.

We must not overlook the practical consideration of this subject. Can there be any effective cure of souls, if we habitually and persistently fail to make a diagnosis? It is true that the Word of God, sown broadcast over all in preaching, will "conquer sinners, comfort saints." But besides this general proclamation of the Gospel, cases constantly occur where a particular and individual application is needed.

For his own sake as well as for his people's sake the minister needs something more than the standpoint of the pulpit. For his own sake, for when he has learned to know the particular burdens that oppress his brother, his preaching will have a new unction and power. And for the people's sake. Many a man is going about with the burden of unforgiven sin who is entitled to the liberty of the Gospel, and he has a right to look to his pastor for something more than a general proclamation of forgiveness.

The loss of this important function of the ministry has not taken place without an effort to provide substitutes. At the so-called mourner's bench of the revival meeting there is only a modern way of pronouncing the evangelical absolution. And the inquiry room of the evangelistic service is another means of securing the same end, namely the personal application of Christ's redemption to the human soul. Necessarily such work is often left in the hands of unskilled people.

We plead for such a view of the Christian ministry that the way may always be open for burdened souls to come to their pastors and receive not simply instruction, but that positive declaration which the word of God authorizes them to make.

ARTICLE V.

FAITH AND REGENERATION.

By HENRY ZIEGLER, D. D., Selinsgrove, Pa.

I. FAITH IN GOD, AND FAITH IN CHRIST.

In discussing the doctrine of regeneration, it will be important, first of all, to fix in the mind a clear idea of the difference between faith in God and faith in Christ, as also, of their relation to each other, and of their natural place in religious doctrine and experience. We refer not to a bare historical, but to a living faith.

We will most readily apprehend what a living faith in God is, by calling to mind the manner in which it is awakened and nourished into vigorous activity.

Such a faith can be awakened only through illumination on the character, the will, and the purposes of God: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," Rom. 20 : 11-17.

We take for granted, as a starting point, belief in the existence of God, and that the Bible is the word of God and our rule of faith and duty ; for until these doctrines are firmly believed, the Bible could not come to us with divine authority to bind the conscience and enforce obedience. But, these doctrines firmly believed, we have the starting point from which, and the elements out of which, to develop a living faith in God.

When now, one who thus believes becomes enlightened to understand and dread the displeasure of God against sin, and to realize and lament his own condemnation, then his faith in God and his word is no longer dead and unfruitful, for it already in-

dicates the possession of the primal element of a vitalizing energy, namely, a willingness to be influenced by the teachings and authority of the word of God. When one is led farther to see that the law is holy, and just, and good, and that God designs, through it, to promote his own highest welfare; when he sees, moreover, that his sins have been committed against a most loving and merciful Father in heaven; and sees, also, their ruinous consequences to himself and others, then a living faith shows itself, in sorrow for sin, hatred of it, and turning from it. When, once more, he hears God's call and promises to the repentant and thirsty soul: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money," etc., and firmly believes them as addressed to himself, then he rests in confiding, joyous trust in "the Father of mercies and God of all comfort;" and he is now ever ready to inquire: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

When the Holy Spirit has begotten this faith in the soul—a faith that brings forth a dread of God's displeasure against sin, conviction of sin, sorrow on account of it, hatred of it, and a turning from it; also, a turning to God, a confiding joyous trust in him and in his pardoning mercy and grace, and a hearty consecration to his service—surely, a faith that produces such fruits is not dead, but living, in the true scripture sense, (James 2 : 14–26) although it may be only an Old Testament faith which has not yet knowingly and specifically accepted Christ.

We may now sum up the elements of a living faith in God, as follows: It is a faith that trusts implicitly in God, especially in his goodness, faithfulness, omnipotence, and promises of pardoning mercy; that accepts his word as authoritative and binding on us as our infallible rule of faith and duty; and that yields absolute and unquestioning submission and obedience to his will as thus revealed to us, including the observance of all his ordinances of saving grace.

Such was the faith of the long catalogue of believers recorded in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. Of Abraham it is said: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should afterwards receive for an inheritance, *obeyed*;

and he went out, *not knowing whither he went.*" Then, of Abraham and the other believers mentioned in connection with him, it is said: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but *having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth,*" Heb. 11 : 8, 13. Again, it is said of Abraham's faith in the promise of God: "So shall thy seed be." That "he was not weak in faith, not considering his own body now dead, being about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb;" and that he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, being fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was able also to perform," Rom. 4 : 18-21.

Of Moses it is written, that, by faith, he "chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;" and that he "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt, because he had respect unto the recompense of the reward;" also, that "through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them," etc., Heb. 11 : 24-29.

Besides, these Old Testament believers also observed, faithfully, all God's ordinances of covenant mercy and pardoning grace especially circumcision, the passover, and the sacrifices of consecration and atonement

The faith of the Old Testament believers did, then, embrace the four elements of a living faith in God, as I have already defined it: namely, Trust in God; Acceptance of the will of God as far as it has already been revealed, and also, as to what might in future be revealed, as authoritative and binding as a rule of faith and duty; Absolute and unquestioning obedience to God; and Observance of all the divinely instituted ordinances of covenanting and saving grace.

It will be shown below, that this faith also virtually embraced Christ.

By a living faith in Christ, we mean a specific faith in him, that accepts and appropriates him as my personal Saviour, as he is revealed to us in the word of God, not on the ground of

any merit in myself, but as the free gift of God, and solely on God's authority. "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will let him take the water of life freely." "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Rev. 22 : 17 ; Acts 10 : 43.

Faith in God as above defined, is *fundamental* and *radical* in religion. It is so, *first*, because of its essential elements as already stated, namely, trust in God ; acceptance of his revealed will as authoritative and binding ; absolute and unquestioning submission and obedience to him ; and the observance of all the divinely instituted ordinances of covenant mercy and saving grace. It is fundamental and radical, in the *second* place, because it is the only true ground and source out of which the Holy Spirit works in us a living, abiding, and comforting personal faith in Christ. Faith in Christ can have validity and saving efficacy only as it rests on the authority of God—only as it rests, primarily, on faith in God, on his will, his purposes, his promises. I must know, first and always, in order to have an abiding and comforting faith in Christ for salvation, that my faith rests ultimately and solely on God's authority and promises. I cannot believe in Christ as the world's Prophet and Redeemer unless I first believe in God and his declaration : "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased ; hear ye him"—unless I first believe that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," etc. This is evidently what Christ meant when he said to his apostles : "Ye believe in God, believe also in me," John 14 : 1. *First*, faith in God ; *then*, and *therefore*, faith in Christ.

This view, (that we are led to a saving faith in Christ, through a living faith in God) may seem to conflict with what Christ says, John 14 : 6, and Matt. 11 : 27 : "No man cometh unto the Father but by me"—"No man knoweth the Son but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

But this coming to the Father only through the Son, and this knowing the Father only as the Son reveals him, can not mean

that we must first have a personal knowledge of Christ, and a personal faith in him, before we can know God, and come to him by a living faith. Its evident meaning is: That we can know the *true ground* on which we can come to God as our reconciled Father, only as we understand and accept the atoning and mediatorial work of Christ.

The true order of knowing God and Jesus Christ, is given by Christ himself, John 17 : 3 : "And this is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." This is the order I have been presenting.

We go one step farther. The person who has this living faith in God, and to whom Christ and his salvation have not yet been made known—such a person, we hold, would accept Christ as soon as he would be made known to him as the divinely promised Christ, the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind. This is verified in the case of Cornelius. After Peter had been made acquainted with the religious character of Cornelius, and also divinely instructed in regard to his duty in his case, he said : "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons ; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10 : 34, 35. Again, Cornelius said to Peter : "Now, therefore, are we all here present before God, *to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.*" To fear God and work righteousness, and being ready to hear whatever God would command him, shows that Cornelius had a living faith in God that led him to accept and submit to the will of God, as soon as, and as far as, it would be made known to him. Consequently, as soon as Peter made known to him God's way of salvation through Christ, he believed on him and accepted him. Acts 10 : 36-48. It would, doubtless, be so in all similar cases.

Faith in God is fundamental and radical, *thirdly*, because it is itself the work of the Holy Spirit ; and because, through it, the Holy Spirit continues to carry on his work of saving grace in the soul. This he did under the old dispensation, where Christ and his atonement were not yet specifically known, but were only adumbrated in types and prophecies ; and this he also now does under the Gospel, through the same faith in God, in

connection with a specific and personal faith in Christ, as founded in, and growing out of, this living faith in God. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." "Purifying their hearts by faith." Eph. 2 : 8 ; Acts 15 : 9.

From Heb. 11 : 26, it might be objected to part of the above statement, namely, that Christ *was not known* to believers under the old dispensation: "Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." But a definite knowledge of Christ, as making the only true and valid atonement for sin by the sacrifice of himself, and as being thus the only true ground of acceptance with God—this knowledge of Christ and his work, they did not have. At best, they knew Christ only as their promised deliverer or redeemer, under the designations: The seed of the woman that was to bruise the serpent's head; the seed of Abraham in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed; the Shiloh to whom there was to be the gathering of the nations; the great prophet like unto Moses, to whom they were to hearken in all things; the anointed one of God; the one who should bear the government on his shoulders, and who was to be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, etc.; the one by whose stripes we are healed, etc.

Under these designations and titles, their faith in God and in his promises virtually embraced Christ, because the promises which they believed included Christ. So, too, their acceptance of the forgiveness of their sins as promised when their sacrificial atonements were made, (Lev. chapters 4, 5, 6, and 16) was a virtual acceptance of forgiveness through Christ, because they (their atonements) were types of Christ and his atoning work.

On this ground alone could the Old Testament believers be justified before God: "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goat should take away sins."

Faith in God is fundamental and radical, in the *fourth place*, because God imputed this faith to the believer for righteousness, under the old dispensation; and thus actually imputed to him, also, the benefits of the atonement of Christ, as the true ground of his justification and acceptance before him, although he had, as yet, no specific knowledge of, nor faith in, Christ.

Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness, not in itself considered, but because of what he believed. His faith was imputed to him in the same way as faith is now imputed to believers in Christ. "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," Rom. 4 23-25. But this text shows, also, that it is not faith itself that is imputed to us for righteousness or justification, but what we believe, namely, that God raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; and that he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

Abraham's faith, and the faith of other believers under the old covenant, was, therefore, imputed to them for righteousness, because it virtually embraced Christ, as we have already shown.

We may add, however, that the specific promise which Abraham believed, when his faith was counted to him for righteousness: "So shall thy seed be," included Christ: "If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3 : 29.

The faith of those Old Testament believers in God did, therefore, virtually embrace Christ, although they had no clear conception of how their promised Redeemer was to accomplish their redemption—God graciously counted their faith to them for righteousness, because they trusted in him and his promises, and embraced and looked for their promised Redeemer, to the extent to which they understood the promises concerning him. See Luke 1 : 67-79, 2 : 25-33; 1 Pet. 1 : 10-12.

II. REGENERATION.

We will now inquire, *What is the scripture signification of regeneration?*

In the first epistle of St. John, we find the following three statements: "If ye know that he is righteousness, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness *is born of him*:" "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God; and every one that loveth *is born of God*, and knoweth God:" "Whosoever be-

loveth that Jesus is the Christ *is born of God*; and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him." Chapters 2 : 29 ; 4 : 7 ; 5 : 1.

In referring to these three declarations of St. John, we will, for the present, designate them merely as *marks* of the new birth.

We will carefully examine these marks.

The first mark is *Doing Righteousness*. St. John give us the following four acts; as evidently equivalent to doing righteousness, and explanatory of it: "Keeping his commandments, or his word;" "Walking even as he walked;" "Doing the will of God;" "Doing the things that are pleasing in his sight." Chapters 1 : 7 ; 2 : 3-6 ; 2 : 17 ; and 3 : 22.

Doing righteousness is, therefore, pleasing God by keeping his commandments, or doing his will as he has revealed it to us ; and especially, as Christ has fully made it known by his doing and teaching.

The second mark is, *Loving the Brethren*. This is not a love that consists in mental emotions, neither in mere profession, but in a Godlike loving consecration that lays one's self on the altar of God, saying, "Here am I:" use me—myself and all I have and am, even to life itself, if need be—to promote the well being and salvation of man. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." 1 John 3 : 16-18.

These marks—doing righteousness and loving the brethren—consisting as they do, in external voluntary acts of our own, can not themselves be the new birth, neither can they produce it, for it is the work of the Holy Spirit—it is the new spiritual soul-life begotten in us by the Holy Spirit, and which makes all our right-doing possible, and from which alone it can proceed.

We conclude, therefore, that St. John presents these marks as evidences of the new birth, or, as divine assurances to us, that where they exist, there the new birth also exists. They are

such evidences and assurance, because they both point, ultimately, to the same new spiritual soul-life, as their source and cause.

What, then, is the new birth of which these marks are the evidences? It is their underlying new spiritual soul-life, (or principles) which alone makes them—(our doing righteousness and loving the brethren)—possible.

The underlying principles of doing righteousness are: *first*, submission to the will of God as our absolute rule of duty—it is the Christ-spirit: "Not as I will, but as thou wilt;" *second*, implicit faith and trust in God and his word, for without this, the first could not exist; and then, *third*, as partly accompanying, and partly underlying and productive of both these, an enlightened understanding that has a spiritual knowledge of God and his will; changed inclinations and affections turned from wrong to right, from evil to good, and from the world and Satan to God; and a renewed will that is endowed with the willingness and the ability to yield God a cheerful obedience.

Loving the brethren, has, as its first and direct underlying principle, the Christ-spirit of self-consecration to the salvation of man. It is the soul in the attitude of willingness and longing desire to give one's self for the promotion of the well-being of others. But this, again, implies faith and trust not only in God, but also in Christ, and again, an enlightened understanding, changed inclinations and affections, and a renewed will.

St. John's third mark of the new birth, is—*Believing that Jesus is the Christ*. This implies the following facts and experiences: *first*, that I believe in the Christ of the Old Testament, promised as the world's Redeemer from sin and the devil; *second*, that I realize that I need this Christ; *third*, that I am fully persuaded that Jesus the son of the virgin Mary, is this Christ; *fourth*, that I accept this Christ as my personal and only Saviour, with the assurance that, in him, I have the forgiveness of my sins, am accepted before God, and am made a child of God by adoption, and an heir to everlasting life; and, *fifth*, that I submit myself absolutely to be governed by his will.

St. John says of this mark, that whoever possesses it, *is* born of God. He does not say, he *shall be*, but he *is*, born of God.

He thus represents the new birth as completed when one believes that Jesus is the Christ.

The same is taught in Gal. 3 : 26, "For ye *are* all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." True, there is one text that apparently contradicts this : "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name," etc., John 1 : 12, 13. But this is capable of a rendering that is in perfect harmony with the foregoing exposition. It may be rendered : But as many as received him, on them conferred he the *right* or *prerogative* of *being* the sons of God, even on them that believe on his name. This rendering is, indeed, required to put it in harmony with the analogy of faith on this doctrine.

What, then, we inquire, is the underlying principle of faith in Christ, which may be considered as the new birth? and which is completed when we believe in Christ?

The Holy Spirit, through the gospel call, and the gospel promises, brings us the divine authority to believe savingly in Christ; and with this authority he also endows us with the ability so to believe. But this ability or power to believe, consists in the same enlightened understanding, the same changed affections and inclinations, and the same renewed will, as explained under the first and second marks. "I believe that I can not by my own reason and strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him; but the Holy Spirit has *called* me through the Gospel, *enlightened me by his gifts*, and sanctified and preserved me *in the true faith*." See also, "The Larger Catechism," (Presb. Ch.) 2, 67.

This enlightened understanding, these changed affections and inclinations, and this renewed will, is the new birth, as indicated by the three marks of St. John.

In Phil. 2 : 12, 13, St. Paul exhorts us to "work out our own salvation," on the ground that "God works in us both to will and to do." God's working in us, therefore, gives us the power or ability to work out our own salvation : God's work in us, is, therefore, our new birth, for it is our new birth, alone, that endows us with the ability to work out our salvation. What, then, does God work in us? It is, "*To will, and to do*."

To work in us, *to will*, includes an enlightened understanding to know the will of God; inclinations and affections turned from evil to good, and from wrong to right; and a will renewed from opposition and rebellion against God, to submission and obedience to him: and to work in us, *to do*, includes in it, the endowment of all the powers of the soul with the ability to act in harmony with this enlightened understanding, with these changed inclinations and affections, and with this renewed will. This is the true and essential new birth, as we have heretofore ascertained it. It is an enlightened understanding, changed inclinations and affections, and a renewed will.

In Col 3 : 10, and Eph. 4 : 24, we have the same view of the new nature inculcated. According to the first passage, the new man is renewed *in knowledge* after the image of him that created him. This is a renewal of divine illumination. According to the second text, the new man is, after God, created *in righteousness and true holiness*. And what is this but righteous affections and inclinations, and a will sanctified or consecrated to God.

But it may also be held, that faith in Christ is the organ through which the Holy Spirit completes the new birth.

St. Paul says, Gal. 4 : 4-6: that God sent forth his Son, "To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, *God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*" That is, God makes use of our faith in Christ, when it appropriates the forgiveness of sins, and the adoption of sons, to produce in our hearts the spirit of his Son, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. In Romans 8, Paul says, "Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." The spirit of adoption which we receive, and the spirit of God's Son which he sends into the hearts of his children, are one and the same thing.

This may properly be called the new birth, or *a* new birth, because it is the Christ-spirit of filial trust in God, and also because it necessarily includes filial affection towards God, and filial submission to God. It is all included in Christ's words: "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take this cup

from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt," Mark 14 : 36. Whoever has this spirit of Christ—this filial spirit of sonship, is indeed, born of God.

Our recognized Lutheran theologians and dogmaticians speak of regeneration in this two-fold sense—they designate the one, regeneration in its narrower or stricter sense; and the other, regeneration in its wider sense.

In the stricter sense, regeneration is concerned in the production or gift of faith in man, or, in creating in him the power of exercising faith, or, of endowing him with spiritual powers to believe in Christ, that he may thus commence a spiritual life; and it is completed in the gift of faith, or, when faith exists; and its effect is confidence resting on the merit of Christ; and all this is produced in man in order that he may attain justification, renovation, and eternal life. It includes an enlightened understanding, changed inclinations and affections, and a renewed will.

Schmid says: "There takes place, therefore, in the regeneration of man, a change which consists in this, that instead of the former blindness in spiritual things there is spiritual knowledge, in place of unbelief there is faith, so that this entirely altered condition of man is represented figuratively by the term, a *new birth*, and the regenerated man as a *new creature*." (Doctrinal Theol., Eng. ed., p. 475).

Form of Concord: "The Lord God draws the person whom he converts, and so draws him, that out of a darkened understanding, is created an enlightened understanding, and out of a rebellious will, an obedient will. And this the Scripture calls creating a new heart." (Müller's Symbolische Bücher, Stuttgart, 1848, vol. II., p. 603, R. 673).

Hollaz says: "Regeneration has respect to the will, and consists formally in the gift of faith, and its effect is confidence resting on the merit of Christ." Also, "Regeneration is the act of grace by which the Holy Spirit endows the sinner with saving faith." (Schmid's Dogmatic, Eng. ed., Phila., 1876, p. 496).

Schmid says: It is "that work of God by which he overcomes the spiritual blindness of the natural man, and his spiritual ina-

bility to believe in the gracious plan of salvation, and creates in man the power of exercising faith." (Ib., pp. 474, 475).

Chemnitz: "Regeneration consists in the gift of spiritual life; that is, in the bestowment of the power of believing, and of saving faith; or, in the illumination of our mind, and the production of confidence in the heart; or, as it is otherwise expressed, in the gift itself of faith." (Ib., p. 479.)

Quenstedt: "Regeneration so precedes that faith may be attained; justification follows, which is of faith." (Ib., p. 497.)

Baier: "Regeneration is an action of God, by which he endows man * * * with spiritual powers to believe in Christ, and thus to commence a spiritual life; or, he produces them"—the spiritual powers—"in him in order that he may attain justification, renovation, and eternal salvation." (Ib., 477.)

Baier calls the above, regeneration in the stricter sense, as it is set forth in John 1 : 13, and 1 John 5 : 1. (Ib., 477.)

From regeneration in the above stricter sense, Baier says, "regeneration in the more comprehensive sense is distinguished." (Ib., 477.)

In this wider sense, Quenstedt says, "It is taken for the restitution of the spiritual life *in general*; and in this way regeneration comprehends under it, also, justification and the renovation which follows it." (Ib., p. 477.)

The Form of Concord uses it in the same sense.

The Apology uses it: sometimes in the sense of justification and adoption as the sons of God; and, again, it includes in it the strong consolation which faith brings to the terrified conscience; the new light and life which it produces in the heart; and generally, our renewal into the divine image.

We will give a few quotations: "The sinner's justification means, that he is changed into a pious being, and born anew of the Holy Spirit." "Through faith alone we obtain the remission of sin for Christ's sake and are justified: that is, the unrighteous are sanctified and regenerated." "From this it is sufficiently evident, that faith alone justifies us before God; that is, obtains grace and the remission of sins for the sake of Christ, and leads us to a *new birth*." "The faith, which, in such fear and terror, cheers the heart and consoles it, receives and experiences the

remission of sin, justifies us and brings life; for this strong consolation is *a new birth, and a new life* "Now since faith is accompanied by the Holy Spirit, and produces in the heart a new light and life, it is true, and necessarily follows, that faith renews and changes the heart. What kind of *a renovation* of heart this is, we learn from the prophet, who says: 'I will put my law in their inward parts.'" "Since faith raises up our hearts, when sunk in the terrors of sin and death, we are regenerated by it, and through it we receive the Holy Ghost, who *renews* them, and thus enables us to keep the law of God, to fear and love him truly, and firmly to trust that Christ was given for us," etc. This faith that thus "renews the heart and disposition, transforms man into a new creature." (Müller's Symb. Books, Stuttgart, vol. I., pp. 95-119).

The question now arises: Does the Apology mean to teach, that justification and adoption as the sons of God, and our renewal in general, all of which follow, and grow out of, faith in Christ—does the Apology mean to teach, that these results of faith constitute, primarily and alone, the new birth, to the exclusion and denial of regeneration in its stricter sense?

The Apology does not say, that justification, and the renewal which follows faith in Christ, is *the* new birth; but that faith leads to *a new birth*; and that the strong consolation which faith brings to the terrified conscience, is *a new birth, and a new life*. This evidently implies, that there exists something else which is strictly *the* new birth. What can this be, other than regeneration in its stricter sense? It is the regeneration taught by St. John. Baier says, that regeneration in the stricter sense is taught in John 1 : 13, and 1 John 5 : 1.

It is, also, the regeneration that is taught by Christ, John, chap. 3. After saying to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," etc., he then declares to him, that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It follows, therefore, that, if he who believes in Christ shall not perish, but have everlasting life, such a believer is born again, for he could not even see the kingdom of God without experiencing the new birth. He who believes

in Christ is, therefore born again, according to the teaching of Christ.

The regeneration taught by St. John, and by Christ, is, therefore, regeneration in its stricter sense, and it is completed when faith in Christ exists; the regeneration taught in the Apology, is, on the contrary, regeneration in its broader sense. It follows faith in Christ. It is only *a* new birth, and *a* new life. It is what our theologians sometimes call *a renewal*, or *renovation*; and it is a change in the already regenerated and converted man.

Baier says: "Renovation, strictly speaking, signifies a real and intrinsic change in the regenerated and converted man." "Ezek. 36 : 26, and Ps. 51 : 10." (Schmid, p. 503.)

Schmid: Renovation is a change wrought in man, "in consequence of which he may be called *a* new man." (p 502.)

St. Paul says, Rom. 12, "And be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by *the renewing* of your mind," etc.; and in Eph. 4 : 22-24, "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and *be renewed* in the spirit of your mind; and that ye *put on the new man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." But this renewing of the mind, and this putting off the old man, and putting on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness—all this is not the new birth as taught by Christ and St. John. It is the renewal that takes place in the already regenerated man; and it may, therefore, be called the new man, and *a* new birth.

It is, therefore, neither un-scriptural nor un-Lutheran, to speak of regeneration in this twofold sense. The two senses do not contradict, but imply each other.

Should, therefore, anyone maintain, that faith in Christ and justification, with the peace of conscience and the new life growing out of them, are *a* new birth, or, are included in *the* new birth, there could be no valid objection to such a view, provided it is admitted, that an enlightened understanding, changed inclinations and affections, and a renewed will, are primarily and fundamentally *the new birth*; and, besides, that such an enlightened understanding, such changed inclinations and affec-

tions, and such a renewed will, even when they refer only to God, and do not yet embrace Christ because he has not yet been made known, are, nevertheless, also essentially and fundamentally *the new birth*.

We add two quotations from Starke's Commentary, on 1 John 2 : 29, and 3 : 9.

"By the new birth we are to understand nothing other than the great change in all the powers of the human soul, according to which man becomes an entirely different being from what he is by nature, in heart, mind, disposition, and all his powers. It includes, nevertheless, adoption and all other gifts of grace."

Again he says of the new birth : "Neither are we to understand, that justification is its principal element, which, in other respects, is included in the new birth, and is here presupposed ; but we are to understand by it that element in the new birth by which one is changed into a different person, and becomes a new creature."

III. CAN ONE WHO HAS A KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUE GOD, BUT WHO DOES NOT ENJOY THE OPPORTUNITY OF KNOWING CHRIST, AND OF BELIEVING IN HIM, BE REGENERATED AND SAVED ?

Before disposing of this question, it will be proper to observe, that whilst St. John's three marks are all New Testament evidences of the new birth, the first mark—(doing righteousness)—is alone its Old Testament evidence. In 1 John 2 : 3-7, the writer tells us, that keeping the commandments, or doing righteousness, is the old commandment which was from the beginning ; and he says of it : "Whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected. Hereby know we that we are in him." This is a universal truth that applies to all—Gentile, Jew, or Christian.

That Abraham was a friend of God, and that he was justified and saved, will not be disputed. But he could not be justified and saved without being regenerated : "Except a man" (any one) "be born again," etc. Whilst, however, Abraham had not a specific knowledge of Christ, and could not, therefore, have a specific faith in him, he had, nevertheless, a living faith in God, as has been hereinbefore shown, and as will still more fully ap-

pear from the following facts: His faith was counted to him for righteousness; he received circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of his faith; and he is held up before us as the father of all them that believe under the new dispensation as well as under the old. But this living faith in God, and which was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, had specific reference to his believing God's promise: "*So shall thy seed be.*" (See Gen. 15 : 1-5, and Rom. chap. 4.) Abraham's faith which was counted to him for righteousness, did not, therefore, knowingly embrace Christ; but it did so, *virtually*, as heretofore indicated, because his faith accepted the whole will of God, not only as far as it was already revealed to him, but, also, as to what might be revealed to him in the future. For Abraham, who had no definite knowledge of Christ, such a faith was valid and saving; but for us, who have God's revelation concerning Christ, our faith, in order to be valid and saving, must embrace Christ. Rom. 4 : 21 : 25.

As has already been shown at the beginning of this article, Cornelius had a living faith in God, that accepted the will of God, not only as far as it had already been made known to him, but that would accept it, also, in whatever Peter would reveal it to him.

In view of this living faith in God, and the righteous life growing out of it, Peter declares: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, *is* accepted with him," Acts 10 : 33, 34. It is not, *shall be* accepted, but *is* accepted with him. Peter here assures us, that men are accepted of God *on the condition* of their fearing him, and working righteousness; and farther, that Cornelius was accepted on the same condition, although he did not yet understand the true ground of the forgiveness of sin and acceptance with God, through Jesus Christ. But to be thus accepted with God, Cornelius must have been regenerated. He was regenerated, for he possessed St. John's first mark, that is, the Old Testament evidence of the new birth, namely, *working, or doing righteousness*; and, besides, he had its underlying principle of fearing God, that is, faith in God and submission to his will. Cornelius was, therefore, regenerated and accepted

with God, before he had a definite knowledge of Christ and a personal, specific faith in him. In short, Cornelius was accepted with God, not because he was already a Christian believer, nor yet because he was governed by the gospel motive—"the love of Christ constraineth us"—for he possessed neither of these; but he was accepted because he was a believer in the Old Testament or Abrahamic sense.

It follows, then, that both Abraham and Cornelius were accepted with God, and were regenerated, although as far as directly recorded, they had only St. John's first mark or evidence of the new birth.

It may, however, be held that they had, *essentially*, also the second mark—love to the brethren. Abraham was intensely concerned for the welfare of his fellowmen, and he was willing to surrender his own rights in order to live in peace with his inferiors, Gen. chaps. 13 and 18. Cornelius was as deeply concerned for the salvation of his kinsmen and near friends, as for his own; and, beside, he was liberal towards the Jewish nation, Acts 10 : 2, 22, 24-33.

God does, then, impute the merit of Christ to such as have this living faith in him (in God) although they do not yet believe in Christ, because he has not yet been made known to them.

And, now, the broader and more general query :

IV. CAN A PIOUS HEATHEN WHO DOES NOT ENJOY A DIRECT DIVINE REVELATION, BE REGENERATED AND SAVED ?

The case of Cornelius would seem to settle this inquiry in favor of the affirmative. To this may be opposed the language of the angel to Cornelius, as the latter related it to Peter, Acts 11 : 14, namely : "Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shalt be saved." But if the foregoing exposition of this subject be accepted as correct, then these words must be interpreted in harmony with our exposition; and this certainly is possible without doing violence to their true intent and meaning, namely, that Peter would make known to Cornelius *the only true and meritorious ground* on which man could be accepted

with God, and *eternally* saved; and, therefore, the only true and meritorious ground on which, also, Cornelius and his whole house must *finally* and *solely* rest for the same acceptance and eternal salvation. Still, it may be held, that Cornelius enjoyed, to some extent, the revelations of the Old Testament; and that his case is therefore irrelevant on the point before us. We turn, then, to St. Paul. He settles our inquiry in the affirmative. In Rom. 2 : 6-11, he says: that "God will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance *in well-doing* seek for glory and honor and immortality, *eternal life*; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, *indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish*, upon every soul that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor, and peace, *to every man that worketh good*, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God."

The condition here laid down, of bestowing eternal life, glory, honor, and peace, is *well-doing*, or, *working good*. It is St. John's first mark of the new birth—its Old Testament evidence.

On this subject we will yet give several brief extracts from "MacKnight on the Epistles."

He represents St. Paul as teaching: "That in judging men God will not proceed according to the tenor, either of the law of nature or of the law of Moses, by inquiring after an obedience absolutely perfect; because, according to that method of judgment, no one could be acquitted. But he will judge their 'hidden things,' their inward frame of mind, 'according to the Gospel': that is, he will examine, whether in the present life men have been guided by a sincere desire to know and do his will, in whatever manner it was manifested to them. And in whomsoever such a faith is found, he will count it for righteousness, and reward it, whether the person who possessed it were a Gentile, a Jew, or a Christian."

Again, "Faith does not consist in the belief of particular doctrines, far less in the belief of doctrines which men never had the opportunity of knowing; but in such an earnest desire to know and do the will of God, as leads them conscientiously to

use such means as they have, for gaining the knowledge of his will, and for doing it when found."

And, once more : "For his" (St. Paul's) "whole reasoning on this subject proceeds on the supposition, that, if it was consonant to justice that the demerit of Adam's disobedience should extend to all mankind, notwithstanding the greatest part of them never knew anything of him or of his disobedience ; it must be equally consonant to justice, that the merits of Christ's obedience should extend to all mankind, who are capable of being benefited by it, although many of them have had no opportunity of knowing anything of that meritorious obedience."

MacKnight then gives his opinion, that Christ and the plan of redemption through him will be made known to the pious heathen after they have been admitted into heaven ; and that this knowledge will then operate as fully to promote the glory of God, the honor of Christ, and their own eternal felicity, as if it had been communicated to them in this life. (See his *View and Illustration on Romans*, chaps. 2 and 5, new ed., Philadelphia, 1835, pp. 62, 63, and 80).

We add Starke's opinion on this subject, as given in his commentary on 1 John 5 : 2. "How necessary it is to believe this article," namely, that Jesus is the Christ, "that one can not be saved in any other way, has already been shown, chap. 4 : 2 ; and, consequently, in the case of a Jew, Turk, or heathen, who neither knows nor believes this doctrine, a new birth can not take place, neither can such an one be saved."

We add, also, from "The Larger Catechism" of the Presbyterian Church, 2, 60. "Can they who have never heard the Gospel, and so know not Jesus Christ, nor believe in him, be saved by their living according to the light of nature?" *Ans.* "They who having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, can not be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess ; neither is there salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the Saviour only of his body the Church."

It remains for the reader to form his own judgment on this subject, in view of all the facts presented. It reduces itself to

this: Can a pious heathen, who has not the knowledge of Christ, be regenerated and saved? or, will all who are destitute of this knowledge, be doomed to eternal perdition?

In conclusion:

V. WHAT IS THE RELATION TO EACH OTHER, OF FAITH IN GOD, FAITH IN CHRIST, AND REGENERATION, AS ASCERTAINED IN THIS DISCUSSION?

Under the Old Testament, we have—

1. Faith in God, and in his plan of salvation, produced through God's revelation of himself and his will, to man.

2. A spirit submissive to the will of God, or a soul-choice of the will of God, as the governing purpose of one's life. "But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." Josh. 24 : 14-24.

This submission to the will of God, or, this soul-choice, in connection with the faith in God and his plan of salvation, is regeneration under the Old Testament—and it includes divine illumination, changed inclinations and affections, and a renewed will.

3. Doing righteousness, or actual obedience to God. This grew out of the first and second—out of faith in God and a soul-choice of God's will as a governing purpose. It is the Old Testament evidence of the new birth.

Though the Old Testament saints had not received the fulfillment of the promises, yet because they were persuaded of their truthfulness, and embraced them by assuredly expecting their accomplishment, they yielded to God a sincere obedience. And of Abraham, particularly, it is said: "*By faith Abraham * * obeyed.*" Heb. 11 : 8, 13.

Under the Gospel, as under the Old Testament, there must be,

1. Faith in God and his plan of salvation, and a soul-choice of his will as one's governing purpose.

2. Faith in Christ, as developed out of faith in God and his plan of salvation. (See Heb. 6 : 9-20). "Ye believe in God, believe also in me."

3. Regeneration in its stricter sense, completed when Christ

is received by faith; and in its wider sense, completed through faith in Christ.

4. A Christ-like consecration of one's self to the well-being of man, or love to the brethren. "The love of Christ constraineth us." * * "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

ARTICLE VI.

THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL.

By REV. C. L. BARRINGER, Valatie, N. Y.

We need not turn to speculation or philosophy to assure ourselves of the double composition of our nature. Our consciousness and experience declare it. The one principle is the spiritual—the soul; the other is the physical—the body. But the peculiar relations, the connecting link between these two, has given rise to many theories and much speculation. To many this may seem to be of but little importance; but its relations to the origin of the human soul, and to our personal immortality, invests it with an importance not readily comprehended. The ancient doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, was revived by Rev. E. Beecher, D. D., in his "Conflict of Ages," in which he strives to harmonize the divine government with man's instinctive ideas of "right and honor." In the early ages of philosophy and speculative theology, there existed a wide diversity of opinion as to the origin of the soul. Some thought that the soul was of the substance of God, and was not only eternal, but holy in its origin. Thus taught the Stoics and Manicheans.

Others taught that all souls were created at once and confined in some place by their Creator, and one at a time was released only when some human body was created for it. Others taught that souls were created only as human bodies were formed for them, and no faster. Others said and held, that as the body was derived from the body, so the soul was derived from the soul; thus taught Tertullian, Apollinarius, and other wes-

tern philosophers. Origen, who did much toward corrupting the early faith, held to the theory and teaching of Pythagoras. He said, that the expression, "There was a man sent from God," as applied to John, Baptist, could be explained only on the theory that his soul existed before his body, and was sent from a former existence to inhabit the body, and so bear witness to or of the truth.

The idea that prevailed among the old philosophers seems to have been that the souls which inhabit human bodies, had their existence first in heaven; and for sins committed there, were sent down to earth, so that now we are atoning for the sins of a former life. But St. Jerome assailed this doctrine with all his powers; he stigmatized it as "impious" and "wicked," and further says, "It now prevails in secret, as in vipers' nests; and as by a hereditary disease, glides in the few to pervade the many." But this doctrine was not confined alone to the wild vagaries of heathen philosophers and speculators. It tainted the faith of many of the "Christian Fathers."

Closely allied to pre-existence, is transmigration; this latter implies the former. Justin Martyr was not entirely free from this idea; for he speaks of the soul inhabiting a body the second time, but adds, that in such a case it has no remembrance of God. Nearly the same, if not the same doctrine was taught by Clemens Alexandrinus; for he speaks of the soul as being sent down from heaven by God. His language is: "The soul is not, therefore, sent down from heaven for the worse. For God works all things towards that which is better; and the soul that leads the best life for God and righteousness, exchanges earth for heaven. By this, he seems to look upon this life as a state of discipline, into which the soul came from another and prior life. In speaking of the body, he says: "It is a form thrown about us externally, the garb of our entrance into the world, that we may be able to enter into this common school-room." Arnobius, also, seems inclined toward the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, though he has some doubts as to the condition of the soul while in that state. It is true that he once said: "Do we not all owe to God, that, sent by him, or fallen by our own blindness, we are held in these corporeal bodies?"

Afterwards doubt seems to have come into his mind, as to whether souls were created and sent into this world by God, for his language is: "Far from us be the wildness of this wicked opinion, that God, omnipotent, maker, founder, and procreator of great and invisible realms, has produced such mobile souls, destitute of gravity and weight, and constancy; liable to vice, prone to every species of sin, and knowing them to be such, has commanded them to enter bodies, imprisoned in which they should live under the storms and tempests of daily life, and do and suffer things base and obscene." In this he does not question the prior existence of the soul, but the origin of the soul in that existence. He also affirms that men are nothing but souls confined in bodies.

The Platonists taught that the soul formed the medium between the purely spiritual and the purely animal in man; between the higher and ideal principle of reason, and the grosser and sensual principle of his carnal nature. Origen held that God gave souls bodies and then sent them into this world to atone for offences previously committed. He accounts for the different conditions in which men are born, and the different capacities with which they are endowed by God, on the supposition that in the pre-existent state they had cultivated different tastes and dispositions, and to those the body and the temporal conditions were adapted. This theory is well adapted in solving the cause of the diversities among angels and men, and it also accounts for the monstrosities to be found in the human family. For they say: "If from unknown reasons the soul be not exactly worthy of being born in an irrational body, nor yet exactly in one purely rational, it is furnished with a monstrous body, so that reason cannot be fully developed by one thus born, having a head disproportioned to the rest of the body, and much smaller." The object of embodying lapsed souls, was their restoration to their original state, or to one still more exalted. This question according to Origen comprises the entire philosophy of our being. The whole theory may be summed up thus: Life is penal, a sort of purgatory, with two ways by which the soul may escape, viz., one, upward to higher grades in the scale of spiritual existence, the other downward toward

the irrational state of being. In short, it is nothing more than the old doctrine of Pythagoras; the transmigration of the soul brought into the Christian Church. This theory of Origen made considerable progress in the early Church, and some of the "Fathers" were tinctured with it.

Jerome and Augustine, while denying the penal part of Origen's theory, were in doubt as to the origin of the soul, and conceded that the soul might have existed in some previous state or form. One of these forms as taught by Hilarius, was that when God created man, the soul was first formed and afterward sent by divine power into the body formed out of the dust.

After Hilarius' time the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul found fewer advocates. It may have been closed by an ecclesiastical decision. In fact, we have reason to believe that this was the case, for toward the close of the fifth century, Leo the Great says, "The Catholic faith constantly and truthfully affirms that human souls did not exist before they were breathed into their bodies." Later on, Justinian speaking on the same subject says, "The Church teaches that the soul is created with the body." So, then, the question of the pre-existence of soul must have been decided during the fifth or sixth century.

But, whence is the origin of this doctrine? How did it find its way into the early Church? Is it or is it not sanctioned by the teachings of Scripture?

As has been stated, this doctrine is to be found in the teachings of the old philosophers. Plato develops it to a greater extent than any of the others.

Many of the fathers, after the apostolic age, became tinctured with the speculative philosophy of the schools. Cassian and Origen in teaching the pre-existence of the soul, only presented that which Plato had taught. Origen, in his reply to Celsus, when advocating the consistency of the doctrine that each soul sent into the body, must necessarily be sent "according to merit and former behavior;" and in this he admits that he is following the teachings of philosophy instead of the teachings of Scripture, of Plato rather than Jesus Christ, for his language is, "I speak these things now after Pythagoras, and Plato, and Empedocles."

The doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul prevailed among the Jews even during the apostolic age. From the Jewish it glided into the Christian theology. It is worthy of note that in all the earlier sacred writings of the Jews no trace of it is to be found.

The theology of the Jews of Palestine became corrupted by that of Alexandria. In the first book of Maccabees mention is made of a sect called Essenes, so this sect existed about two centuries before Christ. Pliny holds that they are even older than that. Be that as it may, they taught that the soul pre-existed and that it was immortal. At first, they taught, that the origin of the soul was through some natural attraction, that it was drawn down from the highest air, and imprisoned in the human body, and when released, winged its way back to the place whence it came. In the course of time many of the Essenes embraced Christianity, and in so doing brought with them many of their notions and practices, and these tended to corrupt the Christian religion.

So, then, the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul flowed through Essenism as well as through Platonism into the early Church. The same doctrine, though in a form more nearly allied to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, was held by the Pharisees. At one time they asked Jesus, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that this man was born blind?" In this it is evident that they assumed a pre-existent state; or, how else could the man have sinned before he was born? It is also evident that this notion existed in the minds of the disciples, and was corrected by the reply which Jesus made, or by his subsequent teachings; for in all their after teachings of doctrines and morals, nothing of it can be found.

Thus far, I have noticed the teachings of the ancient philosophers as to the pre-existence of the soul. What is the teaching of Inspiration?

Dr. Beecher, in his "Conflict of Ages," assumes it as a mode of adjusting the elements of the divine government in consistency with the principles of "honor and right," and thus endeavors to remove the conflict of the ages. He says that, "the

principles of honor and right demand that God shall give to all new-created beings original constitutions, healthy and well balanced, and tending decidedly and effectually toward good. To make them either neutral or with constitutions tending to sin, would be utterly inconsistent with the honor and justice of God, and would involve him in the guilt and dishonor of sin. Moreover, God is bound to place new-created beings in such circumstances that there shall be an over-balance of influences and tendencies on the side of holiness and not of sin." Again, he uses this language: "Those thorough views of innate human depravity, and subjection to the powers of evil, which are recognized as true and scriptural by men of profound Christian experience, and the highest principles of honor and right, which a well-tutored mind intuitively perceives to be true and obligatory upon God as well as man." Having developed these principles of "honor and right," and having assumed that man is a "new-created being," and also the "doctrine of human depravity;" he boastingly inquires, if this is not true, "What becomes of the honor and justice of God?" It seems, then, that the solution of the difficulty, and the removal of the conflict, is to be found in Beecher's theory, that, in the pre-existing state, the soul had been created with such a constitution and placed under such circumstances as the law of right and honor demanded, that it had rebelled and corrupted itself, and, as a punishment, it was sent into this world of sin and misery.

Thus the entire argument as contained in the "Conflict of Ages" may be summed up: In a museum in the City of Albany, N. Y., is the skeleton of a huge mastodon, found in the vicinity of Cohoes. Many of the original bones were never found. How then was the frame erected in its present form? The naturalist supplied the missing ones. His knowledge of the animal structure enabled him to do this. If he was ignorant of animal anatomy he would certainly make a blunder in his attempt to re-arrange the bones. He might imagine some of the bones to be lost, when they were not; and in his effort to supply any real or imagined deficiency, he would be more likely to deform the skeleton than to imitate the work of nature. On the same principle many philosophers undertake to fill up what

they imagine to be lacking in the perfect outline of the divine government.

The logic used by all such reasoners, when put into form, is something about as follows: the supposition of the pre-existence of the soul will remove a difficulty which appears impossible to be removed by any other means; consequently it must be true.

To show the absurdity of such reasoning, we will use an illustration suggested by Dr. Beecher himself. In the early ages it was taught and believed, that our planet was fixed, immovable in the centre of the solar system, and that all the heavenly bodies revolved daily around it. This theory accounted apparently for the motion of the heavenly bodies. But later investigations proved the hypothesis to be false. So, then, a hypothesis may appear to solve a difficulty, or harmonize a presumed contradiction; but after all have no basis in fact. But this supposition of a pre-existing state not only fails for want of direct evidence, but it is inadequate even if it could be established to settle the conflict of the ages. If the soul had a pre-existent state, it now has no remembrance, no knowledge of its acts right or wrong. How, then, can this life be a punishment for it, when it is declared that memory shall constitute a prominent part in the punishment of the soul in the future existence? "Son remember!" is the language of Scripture. Again, the author of "God Revealed in Creation and in Christ," has shown the absurdity of this position with a logic that is conclusive and convincing. As an argument, he assumes a fact taught in the Scriptures, and verified in thousands of cases, viz., "Children do suffer for the sins of their parents." How can this fact be reconciled with the theory of "honor and right?" How does it settle the "Conflict?"

The theorist is willing to admit that the pre-existence of the soul is not taught in the Scriptures. And, yet, according to the position assumed by these teachers, how can the Divine government be vindicated on the principles of "honor and right" without the aid of this hypothesis? Can God be indifferent to the vindication of his government before his intelligent creation? By no means. What, then, is the thing here set forth as a fact

too obvious to require the elucidation and authority of revelation? None would be so bold as to assert this. Nothing is left us then, but to believe that these pseudo-philosophers, who were so zealous to vindicate the divine government, have failed to comprehend the principles and designs of that government in its length and breadth; and that there are other methods of vindication which they have failed to discover. If there was a necessity for the doctrine, there was a necessity for a revelation concerning it. Another objection to this theory, is, that it is inconsistent with some of the well-established facts of philosophy. Personality implies self-consciousness. Continued personality implies continued self-consciousness. If not so, then personal identity is lost. Looking forward into the great future, we recognize the fact that our personal identity will be preserved, and that our self-consciousness will accompany us. On this fact rests whatever we may expect or hope by the way of reward or punishment in that future existence. It will be this continued identity which will form the connecting link between this present life and the life that is to come. If memory and self-consciousness utterly perish at death, then, in that future state, we will be different creatures from what we now are.

So of the supposed pre-existent state. We have no recollection of it: no self-consciousness reaching back and connecting us with that state. If we existed then and there we do not know it; if in that state we committed sin we are now unconscious of it. All we can say, then, is, that "if some being, called by my name, preceded me in another state of being, he failed to bring with him in the transition that introduced him into this world as me, that self-consciousness so essential in order to connect me with himself; and, therefore, he is to me as though he had never been. I cannot own myself to be a continuation of him, nor responsible for any acts he may have committed while in that state."

The Scripture nowhere gives any confirmation, nor lends any countenance to the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul. Whenever it has been attempted to prove the doctrine from or by the Scripture, it has been by the most far-fetched and inconsistent constructions put upon isolated passages. And yet the

Bible does teach us something concerning the soul, when it says, "God created man in his own image." What is created here? Certainly not the body; for it declares, in the image of God, and "God is spirit." It must then be the soul, the spiritual part of man. Paul speaks of Adam as the first man, and refers to the process of being, as well as to the relation of Adam to Christ, for he adds: "That was not *first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and *afterward* that which is spiritual. So far, then, as the Scripture speaks on the subject, it is in direct opposition to the doctrine of a pre-existent state. The assumption that we are placed here to atone for sins committed in a previous state, is glaringly at variance with the moral and governmental teachings of the word of God. The whole remedial dispensation is based upon the fact that we have sinned in *this life*, and it has reference to the sins of this life, and not to the sins of a former. If there was a former life in which we sinned, where is the atonement for those sins? If there was a previous state in which the soul sinned, then Christ did not comprehend the design of his own mission; for he rebuked men for actual sins, sins of this life. He came to this world to deliver from such sins, and not from the sins of a former existence.

Grant to the advocates of a pre-existent state of the soul all they claim, what advance have they made in the vindication of the divine government? They have only succeeded in changing the point in the controversy by removing it backward to a previous state, and have not taken a single step in advance toward the settlement of the question concerning the divine government. If it is difficult to reconcile the fact of the fall of man, and of human depravity with the principles of right and honor in the divine government, it is far more difficult to account for such a fall in a pre-existent state.

By changing the position we make the question more difficult of solution. For, then, we have not only the fall to reconcile with the principle of right and honor in the divine government, but also the assumed fact, that we are here punished for the sins of which we have no knowledge, and committed in a state of being of which we are entirely ignorant.

ARTICLE VII.

THE DEVIL, THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD.

A BIBLE STUDY.

By REV. J. T. GLADHILL, A. M., Jersey Shore, Pa.

All our knowledge of the devil must be derived from the Bible. The Bible is the history of God's manifestations to men. One of the necessities of such divine manifestation is, that there is a moral power in this world directly antagonistic to the divine mind. Therefore any history of God's relations to this world, will necessarily contain reliable data concerning the devil.

A study of the Bible to find the facts concerning the devil, may regard the history of specific doctrines as valuable or worthless. It will be valuable as far as doctrines are founded upon the divine word; or worthless in using mythology as an interpreter of divine truth.

We shall treat the devil's history under three periods: Pre-Adamite, historical, and his last conflict and defeat.

I. His Pre-Adamite history. That he is a fallen angel from heaven would be very hard to prove. The Scriptures give no warrant, or even a clue, to such a supposition. Milton's poetic license cannot be accepted for Scripture interpretation. Mythology will never rise to the assurance of God's word. The proof-texts used to substantiate the fact that he is a fallen angel are the following: Isa. 14 : 12-15, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt myself above the stars of God * * yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit." The prophet speaks of Babylon in this chapter, and no interpreter of Scripture will pretend that there is even a remote reference to the devil. Another Scripture, and that quoted with confidence in Schaff's Herzog, is Luke 10 : 18: "He said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning

fall from heaven." Jesus used these words when the seventy disciples returned saying, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy word." It is presumed that as a fallen angel he would have been cast out of heaven before the preaching of the disciples going "before Jesus' face into every city and place whither he himself would come." And, further, we know that his satanic deeds were done on earth for four thousand years. Jesus tells the disciples that Satan's power has been broken, and he is being subdued and conquered by men. Another reference is to 2 Peter 2 : 4, and Jude 6 ; both verses containing the same idea, but explaining each other. "God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell (*τάραρος*), and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." "And angels which kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." It is not asserted, yet may be inferred, that these angels were cast out of heaven. The devil is never called angel, but is separated from them, as "the devil and his angels." Therefore we have no legitimate right to class him as one of the angels spoken of by the apostles. Further, the statement that they are kept in bonds unto the Judgment-day, will preclude the devil from their number, as he is "the prince of this world" and not yet in bonds. The fourth reference is Rev. 12 : 7, 8, 9 : "And there was war in heaven ; Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon ; and the dragon warred and his angels ; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven," * * and the devil was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him." St. John, on the isle of Patmos, heard one talking which said, "Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter." The war in heaven is designated as among the things which must be hereafter ; and is related in the midst of the wonderful panorama of the future. The devil cast out of heaven is one of the things that "shall be hereafter." We therefore assert with confidence, that the devil never was in heaven ; at least so far as the Scriptures warrant us to believe.

The thought itself is not to be attributed to God. That he

had made man, or would make man to have dominion in the earth, and then cast a troublesome creature out of heaven to the earth, as though God could not be worried with him, but man shall be, is so unlike all that is revealed of God that we declare it repulsive.

Many Lutheran fathers think that the angels were created within the six days. The prince of this world never was called an angel, yet was created to be a messenger or servant of God on this earth. He properly belongs to the creatures which God made on the earth. We are justified by some inferences in thinking that he belongs to the creatures of the sixth day, yet bearing some of the marks of the fifth day creatures. He is called the serpent and the dragon which will associate him with the creeping things and reptiles. But, created the prince of this world, he was endowed with wisdom and understanding. "The serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made."

Taking his works as described in Scripture, and comparing them with the teachings of geology of the period of reptiles, and succeeding periods, we discover a remarkable likeness. If he was a prince over the living things of that period, he was appointed to rule them for the honor and glory of God. But instead of this we find death and destruction prevailing everywhere. Every beast was not only against every other beast, but was intent upon the destruction even of its own kind. The creatures of the fifth and sixth days of creation, from the lowest order up to man, were all dealing death and destruction, and were arrayed against each other.

Then we would infer that the prince of this world fell from his holy estate long before the completion of the creation. But against such an idea, Gen. 1 : 31 says, "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." Can the two thoughts be reconciled? They confront each other, whether reconcilable or not. Everything that God made was very good, but they did not remain so. Geology bears testimony to the presence of sin, and its dreadful fruits all over the animal kingdom. That they were not made so by the Creator we are confident. God's testimony of "very good" can be, and

must be attributed to every creature. Outside of satanic influences, many or all these creatures will answer *yea* to God's testimony. We cannot say therefore, when the prince of this world fell from God, but we feel confident that before Adam's fall he had involved the creation of God, as far as his influence could go, in destruction. Therefore Jesus declares, "He was a murderer from the beginning." The devil made this claim of dominion when he said to Jesus, "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it." It is when the devil speaks the truth that his temptations are most dangerous. In the desperation of his attempt to conquer the Son of God, he was willing to compromise all he had. I judge therefore that he is the prince of this world, and was such before the fall of Adam. Some things may be speculation, but there is more than a modicum of truth in the claim we have made. How long his murderous reign continued before the fall of Adam, we cannot tell, much less speculate upon; but there must be some place, and some reason to account for that dreadful satanic picture which geology has read in the rocks and caves of this earth. The satanic hand is clearly marked in this earth's pre-Adamic history. To attribute these things to God, or nature's laws, is a sacrilege. Nay, the prince of this world became the very devil he is shown in subsequent history, showing his murderous hatred towards the whole creation of God.

When God made Adam, he placed him in a garden, indicating a wall of protection. This protecting care God never withdrew from those who fear him.

Our conclusion is, that God made the prince of this world to be a prince and to have dominion. This principality has been carried out in sin, rather than in righteousness as God designed.

II. The second period of the rule of the prince of this world, is during historic times; or from the fall of Adam to the beginning of the last times.

The Scripture writers have drawn a few pen pictures of the devil, and his methods and work. The devil's part in the fall of Adam and Eve is told with such precision, that no literary critic

dare call it an allegory. It is real and described as a reality. The author gives his reason for believing it a real transaction, when he says, "The serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field."

Notice his methods. He approaches the woman with a question, and knowing the answer, "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" The woman replied in the affirmative, and stated God's prohibition: "Of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it; lest ye die." To this the serpent replies, "Ye shall not surely die," which is a plain, direct contradiction of God's word. She faces the thought that both cannot be true. The Serpent then adds: "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods (or like God) knowing good and evil."

(a) He contradicts God's word, (b) accuses God of taking advantage of man's ignorance, and not doing the best for them; (c) intimates that God may be jealous of the knowledge they may acquire, and (d) presents a selfish motive which begets a sense of pride in the human heart. There was a mixture of truth and falsehood, which the woman could not discern. Her confidence in God was shaken. She thought this is a highway to divine attainments. St. Paul says: "The woman was deceived." The serpent applied his arguments with the art of a practiced mind. He understood logical presentations and conclusions. His arguments were clearer, and sent with more direct aim and force than he ever exhibited afterward. He saw a new ruler who was to have dominion over all the earth. If man succeeds, the devil realized that he must get out of the way. Therefore his first attempt meant dominion and power. He planned well, spoke artfully, and succeeded in part. He thought his victory was complete.

The Lord God came on the scene, and said unto the serpent: "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise

his heel." Gen. 3 : 14, 15. That old serpent thought he had a signal victory. He had crossed the protections which the Lord afforded the man and woman. He fought his battle, but had not calculated his foe. In that sacred inclosure he met the Lord who hurled a curse upon him, and put him beneath all beasts and cattle. Thereafter he knew that he was inferior, and such he must be, and whatever he shall gain over this earth must be by deception. His conquest over man did not have hope of friendly intercourse, but enmity. The devil never wins a friend, but will always find an enemy in man. Though man do the devil's bidding, it is not as a friend, but hatred of the victim he may destroy.

Again, the Lord proclaims a promise through the seed of the woman. That promise is not made to the woman, but to the serpent, and the woman hears the blessed word. What a strange word it is. Hope and salvation to man; utter and eternal defeat to her enemy, and himself forever excluded from any hope of salvation. Was not this the act that placed him under the curse of eternal damnation? He can only use the power he has gained upon the heel of man; and man may and can crush him forever. The serpent gained a victory but it was dearly bought.

Another sacred writer gives a picture of Satan, that has all the appearance of a real experience. This is the book of Job in all the forty-two chapters. The book of Job is a picture drawn by a master hand. The theme is Job's religious integrity. Satan uses his utmost power to destroy that man of God. In our limited space, we cannot present a full criticism of the book, but we will present an outline to show Satan's power, methods, instruments and agencies.

Satan presented himself among the sons of God at their accustomed meeting before the Lord. The Lord divined the object of this coming, viz., the consideration of Job as a perfect and upright man, "fearing God and eschewing evil." Satan, true to his name, became an accuser, and charged that Job feared God, because God had hedged him about with riches and health, and all that this world calls blessed. Satan then sent the Sabeen robbers, and the Chaldean army to fall upon the

property and servants of Job to destroy them, using wicked men to carry out his purpose. He sent also fire and a great wind to destroy the flocks, and the house wherein Job's children were feasting, using the powers of nature to destroy all that surrounded the man of God. Satan smote Job with sore boils, from the sole of his foot unto his crown, which no doubt was elephantiasis or leprosy. Affliction was used to make him curse God.

These afflictions had reference only so far as Satan had considered Job's religious character. Job did not curse God, but submitted to what he supposed was the providence of God.

God had forbidden Satan to touch Job's life. But Satan now resorted to another means of touching his life. Three friends came to sympathize with, and comfort Job in this terrible affliction. When they saw him, they sat down with him seven days, and mourned with him. After this Job's soul, unable to contain itself any longer, broke out in a pitiful wail, wishing that he were dead. This gave occasion for speech by the friends. They began with the assertion that his affliction was a punishment for sin. These men took for granted that all affliction is a chastisement of God. The same philosophy is still taught. We will go to Jesus for an answer, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither," John 9: 2, 3. Eliphaz starts upon a high moral plane in his accusation. But under Job's replies, the moral tone and patience of the friends have so degenerated that we not only recognize in them "the accuser," but the moral degeneracy of Satan himself. The hand of Satan is apparent in all their arguments. Instead of sympathy, comfort, or helpfulness, they strike their fiery darts into his soul. He feels it and tells them so. God also condemned their conduct. If their words and spirit had been of righteousness God would not have condemned them, and made their pardon depend upon a burnt offering and the prayer of Job.

Job was ignorant of the conflict waged concerning him. Satan was not allowed to touch his life. Job felt that his life at the beginning of the battle was very weak, but it grew stronger as he argued for his integrity. If he offended against God, he

did not know it. We imagine that this experience was repeated again in St. Paul, "Lest I should be exalted above measure * * there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me. Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee." So, that same divine grace sustained Job, until the victory vindicated Job, and God's opinion of him also.

Satan used the powers of nature, the power of bad men, and the power of good men (such we understand the three friends to be) to overthrow the piety of Job. He retired from this conflict, not again to meet God in open battle. God's grace does and will sustain men in their fiercest trials.

Again, in Zech. 3 : 1, 2, we see Satan standing at the right hand of the high priest, Joshua, to resist him, and the Lord rebuked him. Satan departed, but his hand is seen in the building of Jerusalem and the temple, as recorded by Ezra and Nehemiah. What Zechariah saw in a vision was experienced by the builders. Satan's success is apparent in such instances as these, (1) The adversaries procured a decree from Artaxerxes and stopped the work, Ezra 4th chap. (2) Haggai and Zechariah prophesied to the Jews and they began to build the house of God at Jerusalem. But Tatnai and others hindered the work until Darius the king confirmed the decree of Cyrus concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, Ezra 5th and 6th chaps. (3) The whole book of Nehemiah shows opposition to the Jews, and that without provocation. It seems that to hinder the people of God was their only aim. The Lord's rebuke of Satan meant that he was resisting the priest of God, and the restoration of worship at Jerusalem.

It has been said that the people of the Old Testament had no conception of Satan as their adversary, and that the Jews formed their ideas of him after the captivity. And these ideas they borrowed from Persian Dualism. This may be true of the people, but it is not true of the Old Testament and its teachings. The teachings concerning Satan are as clearly stated as those concerning God. The writers have delineated his character and work with such clear portrayals that there can be no doubt that

the Old Testament has no uncertain story to tell. It is also true that men of the Old Testament have attributed Satan's works to God. Job thought that God was the author of his afflictions; but his mistake does not make it true. The Old Testament attributes all evil to Satan. The speeches of men are not divine revelation, (though recorded in the Bible), and must not be so interpreted.

The New Testament clearly defines what is satanic and what divine. Let us follow the satanic history here also.

The devil is aware that he must now meet the Son of God. "The seed of the woman shall bruise thy head" does not drive him from his purpose. He had been destroying the works of God, but generally by making man his ally. Now the Son of God must be met.

Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. Jesus submitted to this compulsion of the Spirit. This temptation lasted forty days, during which he ate nothing. What actually transpired in these days of temptation we do not know. But that the devil tried him with all his powers we are certain. The only echoes that come to us from those fateful days are recorded in Heb. 4 : 15. "He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Again, when he taught his disciples to pray, he put into their prayer to God, "Lead us not into temptation." The remembrance of those forty days are not forgotten. He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and prays the Father in heaven that we should be delivered from the evil one. We would judge that Jesus felt the power of the devil's fiery darts.

Three trials are recorded which took place after the forty days, and one, at least, not in the wilderness. Then he was an hungered, "And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God [he was fully convinced that he was dealing with the Son of God, as were the demons also], command that these stones be made bread." Why not use his creative power to supply his personal wants? Jesus remembers still that he is man's representative, and that man cannot make the stones turn to bread; and he will not take advantage of divine power when tempted "like as we are." He replies, "Man shall not

live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." His confidence in God is aimed at. Jesus must be led to become independent of God. The tempter aims high. His purpose is far reaching. If the Son can be separated from the Father, confidence between them is broken. But the reply from the word of God drives the devil back. Jesus' faith in God and his word is established. He must attack him him at some other point.

The devil setteth Jesus on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, "If thou be the Son of God cast thyself down." God will take care of thee. It is written he will give his angels charge concerning thee; as though he would say, thou hast such confidence in God, and truly there is reason for it, now display thy faith in God. It seems that the devil thought that God would not bear him up. He knew that the Spirit led Jesus out to be tempted, and that God was not taking such care as is in the psalmist's mind. The devil's idea seems to be that Jesus would be tempting God, and would be killed in the fall. Then the mission of the Son of God as the Redeemer of men would be frustrated. Jesus declares that this was to tempt the Lord thy God. He was not asserting his divinity to get rid of the tempter, but that this temptation meant that Jesus himself would be tempting the Lord. Surely Jesus would not have declared that the Lord is the devil's God.

A third temptation. "All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them will I give thee. They are delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou, therefore, wilt worship me, all shall be thine." Luke 4 : 5-7. I regard the devil as speaking the truth, when he declared that the kingdoms of this world were his to give. He held possession of them all. God would not dispute the point concerning any one of them. Jesus called him the prince of this world." What does the temptation mean? It means a compromise. The devil proposes that the mission of Jesus be fulfilled. He will surrender all to the Son of God, but that the Son in return will worship the devil. The devil speaks thus: "I am aware of the promise that the heathen shall be thine inheritance. Thy mission on earth is to bring the whole world to thyself. Thou didst create

the world and made it good. I have won it from thee. I will now give all to thee. I will surrender all my dominion and rights to thee, thy mission on earth is gained. It is easy now to accomplish all this, only worship me. My only gain is, to be over thee." Joseph was the governor of all Egypt, but he was the lieutenant of Pharaoh. Jesus would receive all the world, but the devil would be his master. The plan is a compromise in which both make concessions, but the devil's concession is most liberal, why should not Jesus gain his ends without the suffering which he knew was before him? What an ingenious argument! Many men have fallen into the snare. But the devil means more than he says. He surrenders the kingdoms of this world, and asks to be put upon God's throne; if not this, he will drag the Son of God down to be the servant of the devil. But I take it that he meant the first; for Jesus replies, "Get thee behind me, Satan; for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Jesus understands the purpose aimed at, and sends the devil away defeated at every point.

"And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season." St. Luke inverts St. Matthew's order of the second and third temptations. St. Matthew generally presents the logical, while it is likely that St. Luke has followed the chronological order. In the feature to tempt Jesus into moral submission, the devil designs to destroy his life. When he failed to persuade Jesus to cast himself down that he might kill himself, the devil departed from him for a season. Jesus' victory was complete, and the devil made no more attempts upon his moral integrity. His future aim was to bring about Jesus' death.

The hand of the devil is seen frequently touching Jesus' life. When he was asleep in the vessel, "there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with waves." The frightened disciples awoke him. "He arose and rebuked the winds and the sea." God was not in that storm, neither was it nature. Jesus came not to rebuke God nor nature, but "to destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," Heb. 2 : 14.

The opposition of the people of Galilee caused Jesus to cease to travel in their country. He was also requested to leave the country of the Gergesenes. Why? Because he had cast a legion of demons out of a man. The demons, like the devil in the wilderness, recognized him as the Son of God. When the keepers of the swine told what was done, "the whole city came out to meet Jesus, and besought him that he would depart out of their coasts." It is quite natural to infer that the devil was the instigator of this action. If he raised opposition to Jesus in one place we infer also that he was the power that influenced the Galileans, and the dwellers in Jerusalem and Judea to persecute him from one place to another.

The malicious hatred of the chief priests and the scribes and the elders of the people, was not an ordinary passion; but it was fanned to a white heat. The multitude in four days changed from hosanna to crucify him. The first was the outburst of their enthusiasm; to accomplish the last there must have been a wonderful power over men. Men do not make such changes under ordinary influences. The actions of the rulers and the people were not human, but satanic. But we have proof that the devil was active at that particular time. "Then entered Satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve, and he went his way and communed with the chief-priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them. And they were glad." Why such a unanimity of spirit, except that he that had entered one heart, had also entered the others?

The devil gained his purpose. He followed the Son of God to his death. His hand is red with blood. God's words, "Thou shalt bruise his heel," are fulfilled. But the other prophecy, "It shall bruise thy head" is to be fulfilled through the victory of the Son of God over death and the devil. These words spoken to the serpent must ring in his ears. His doom is nearer by his victory in bringing about the death of Jesus.

He seems to have exerted more power over men during the ministry of Jesus, than ever before or since. Demoniacal possession, it seems, was peculiar to that time. When the seventy returned with joy, saying, the demons are subject unto us

through thy name, Jesus said, "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven." The power he once had over men is broken. The followers of Christ have power over the devil.

The apostles had a clear conception of the devil's personality. They understood and felt his influence as a hinderer of their work. They have noted some of the stumbling blocks he cast in their way. We need but to take a passing glance at the devil, as we journey with the apostles.

1. The apostles associated the devil with the depravity of man. "In time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," Eph. 2 : 2. "The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not," 2 Cor. 4 : 4.

2. The apostles taught that the devil set himself against the progress of the kingdom of God; also to destroy the Church, organized for the dissemination of piety. Elymas withstood Paul and Barnabas, and sought to turn an interested hearer from the truth, when Paul looked on him and said, "O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness," Acts 13 : 7-10. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle * * against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places," Eph. 6 : 11, 12. Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost," Acts 5 : 3.

3. Jesus and the apostles taught that he is a personal enemy of the Christian, torturing and seeking to destroy him. "Satan hath desired to have thee that he might sift thee as wheat, but I prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Satan asked of Jesus that he might try the apostle, as he did Job. But the Lord stood by his chosen. This same apostle declares, "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour," 1 Peter 5 : 8.

4. They realized also that Satan hindered their movements. When Paul and his associates desired once and again to go to Thessalonica, "Satan hindered them." He tells the Corinthians

of his labors, his strifes, his imprisonments and threatened death. He was in peril by land and sea, by his countrymen, by heathen and by false brethren. It seems that the powers of nature and of man were arrayed against him. Who was the instigator of these perils and sorrows? The continuation of his story reveals the hinderer of old, "There was given me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me."

5. The apostles knew Satan's manner and ways of deceiving and deluding mankind. Christ had called him a murderer and liar and the father of lies, and said "he sowed his seed by night." The apostles are not surprised that Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." His subtlety is exhibited in treacherous snares (1 Tim. 2 : 26) wiles (Eph. 6 : 11) and devices (2 Cor. 2 : 11).

6. The apostles also understood that the devil used the powers of nature and of man to carry out his purposes. If he is the prince of the power of the air, he surely rules the storms and the floods, and through them sends desolation and destruction over the earth. The ruler of the darkness of this world will not make light to shine whereby evil shall be exposed, but will keep the world in darkness and ignorance. In the Old Testament men spake as though God were the author of evils. They spake thus in the very face of divine revelation. But Christ and the apostles lay the evils of this world to the hand of the devil. Many modern ideas of God and the devil are taken from the sayings of uninspired men, as though they were inspired. Inspired men have recorded the facts of history faithfully, but are not responsible for the mistakes of the men they record. We must discriminate between divine revelation and human notions.

7. They declared that the devil had the power of death (Heb. 2 : 14) and also the power of sickness and disease. Jesus came to destroy death and the power of the devil. He bare our sicknesses, and declares concerning the woman who had a spirit of infirmity that Satan hath bound her, lo, these eighteen years (Luke 13 : 16). Yea, his hand and voice were against the diseases and infirmities of humanity. The devil is the author of disease and death which Jesus came to destroy.

8. The apostles associated sin and the devil in the human heart. So that sin itself is essentially devilish. "He that committeth sin is of the devil," 1 John 3 : 8. He has so possessed men that they voluntarily do his bidding, and must bear the consequences themselves. All observation confirms this, yet they will sin, being led into it, and deserted when they are caught, *e. g.*, Judas, Ananias, and Elymas. They suffered as evil doers and no man pitied them.

9. They understood also that he is a leader in all wickedness, lawbreaking and disturbances in the world, "whose coming is according to the workings of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing," 2 Thes 2 : 9, 10. Heresies in the Church and the coming of antichrist are under his leadership. He becomes an angel of light to deceive the elect of God.

10. The apostles understood that the devil is weak and cannot stand before the man whose faith is in God: "Resist the devil and he will flee from you." At times, it seems that all power was in his hands, but he is helpless before the unwilling man. He cannot lead, persuade nor compel any man to do his bidding. His power alone is in hindering, and using the powers of this world to vex or torture the man bent upon the service of God. His temptations fall harmless ; yet he is watchful for the opportunity to deceive the very elect.

11. The apostles nowhere attributed temptation or evil to the hand of God. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God ; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man," Jas. 1 : 13. If there is an apparent conflict between this assertion, and the words of Old Testament speakers, we must understand that the apostles had the full light of the sources of good and evil. Many Old Testament speakers were ignorant of the truth. They attributed to God the evils that occurred in the world, because they thought that God was the only power in the universe. If they had studied the revelation they had they would have known that the devil is the author and source of evil, no matter how manifested.

Luther's frequent reference to the devil is not the effect of an over-wrought imagination, rather his careful study of the Bible.

Luther recognized his personality, as well as his malicious and deceptive power. He believed that the devil was the author of the evils in Church and State.

III. We now come to the third period of the career of the prince of this world, viz., during the last times. In this he makes a desperate effort to overcome the power and kingdom of Christ, and becomes aggressive in his warfare. His efforts since the death of Christ have been to destroy the kingdom of heaven set up on earth. But that kingdom has gone forward and gathered the millions of earth into its fold. He feels that he has lost the last nation and people of earth. They have heard the Gospel which is proclaimed in all tongues, and to all peoples. His efforts have been ineffectual. He has made all the earth to mourn, yet at the same time the nations have been won to the Lord and his Christ. The signs of the end are coming, yes in view.

John's prophetic vision takes in the scenes of the latter days. The seals have been opened, the angels have given their messages. The plagues and woes of the last times have been poured out upon the earth. Then, in the midst of the last woes, before the pouring out of the last plagues a sign is seen in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun "brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron." Rev. 12th chapter. Who is that woman but the Church bringing forth her Lord again to rule the nations forever and ever? The devil has no more dominion. He sees the end of his career. He must give up the earth and all his claims therein. Once he offered them to the Son of God; now they are won from him by the choice of the nations. He makes one more desperate effort. He rises with his armies to the very gates of heaven, yea he tries to enter to destroy the woman and her child. Observe, he is called the great red dragon, only enlarging himself from the subtle serpent in the Garden of Eden. Now comes war. Before it was diplomacy. All his former efforts were by persuasion, and cunning, outward onslaughts, (a kind of guerrilla warfare.) Now he with his armies meets the armies of heaven. Michael and his angels now meet the dragon and his angels in war. It must have been a terrible conflict. It was the last struggle of despair.

But the dragon and his host "prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world."

Then was a voice heard. "Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ. For the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accuseth them before our God day and night. And they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony. * * But it is woe for the earth and for the sea; for the devil is gone down unto you having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time." Rev. 12: 9-12. The devil used his time to persecute the woman, and his great power seemed overwhelming. When he cast water out of his mouth, as a river, after her, the earth helped the woman, and swallowed up the river. In all the Church's previous experience, the earth did not help her. Now the earth is won for the Lord, and helps the Church in her conflict with the devil. Then he left her to make war with her seed, which keep the commandments of God and hold the testimony of Jesus.

This was a sign of the end. The seven angels pour out their vials full of the last plagues, and the end is hastening. The devil is not noticed in the fast flying visions of the judgment. Then we see the white horse and his rider, called Faithful and True, taking possession of the earth; and the armies of heaven followed him upon white horses. Then the beast and the kings of the earth, and the unclean spirits which came out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the blaspheming beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, all a mighty army, gathered together to make war against him that sat upon the horse. The battle is now on earth. Jesus, the King of kings, is attacked by the blaspheming beast and his armies. The defeat is decisive. Jesus is conqueror. The beast, and the false prophet, and them that worshiped his image, are taken and cast alive into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone. (Rev. 19th chap.)

Then an angel came down and "laid hold on the dragon, that

old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and burned him," and cast him into the abyss. He is shut in, and it is sealed over him, so that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished. He is imprisoned, held under the hand of his mighty Conqueror. His boast had been that he was the victor over God and the whole earth. The battle was a fair one. God did not exert his almighty power to overwhelm him. God won the heart of man unto himself, and gave grace to overcome the devil. It has come. Man has redeemed the earth from the dominion of the devil. He was the prince of this world by creation and conquest. Man has now risen in his union with the God-man, and redeemed the earth from the power of ungodliness, and set up the throne of righteousness, and exercises a righteous dominion. Man's first dominion was hopelessly lost, yet God begat in him a new spirit, and he now becomes a true redeemer of his lost position and authority. It is not of man, but the new spirit which God imparted to the man, that makes him a hero and a conqueror.

God's hosts fought the battles, captured the leaders, and cast them into the lake of fire. But the devil was detained a prisoner, to show him that the seed of the woman was the real conqueror.

When the thousand years are finished, Satan is loosed out of his prison, and gathers his host from the abyss of Hades, goes forth to deceive the nations, and to make war over the whole earth. But the nations were not deceived. But the fire comes down out of heaven and devoured them. Then the devil was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.

It may now be asked, Does that lake or Gehenna of fire now exist? Sheol or Hades is the place of the dead, to which both the righteous and wicked go, till the great day of the resurrection. The devil, as the prince of this world, held his place, with his demoniacal angels, in this world, till he was shut up in the abyss of Hades. But at the final battle the blasphemous beast and the false prophet were cast into the lake of fire. Was it made before there was any use for it? It was prepared for the devil and his angels. The time of such preparation could easily be reserved till the consummation of the earth's righteous vic-

tory. Then into it will be cast all those who followed the devil in his fortunes and promises. The Judge of all the earth draws the line where men in their free choice had made it. "For the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

We have given, what we understand to be an outline history of the devil, as we find it in Scriptures. Some views presented, may not seem at first sight to be strictly in accord with accepted views. But these views in some cases attribute satanic deeds to God. Hence this study. It is hoped that as we know the devil's deceptions, we will the more earnestly hate him and his ways.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE WORD OF GOD IN THE SACRAMENTS.

By REV. J. TOMLINSON, A. M., Du Bois, Pa.

The Church of God is that divine institution which contains all those who are the professed friends of Christ, among whom the Gospel is truly preached and the sacraments are duly administered. In connection with the establishment of his Church on earth, Christ instituted the sacraments, which are to be administered within its fold and which are intended to offer and confer the most important spiritual blessings. The Augsburg Confession says: Ceremonies are needed to this end alone, that the unlearned be taught. Christ does not burden his Church with ceremonies. Christ ordained *only* two sacraments, but these were simple and well-chosen, instructive and impressive. As the Lord should be sought through the ordinances of the Christian Church, as well as by earnest prayer and thorough Bible study, it might be profitable to consider carefully and prayerfully the *word of God* in the *holy* sacraments; for without the word of God there is no sacrament. There is no more important or interesting question within the sphere of theological science, or in the exercise of the pastoral office, or Christian ex-

perience, than *that* concerning the sacraments. The sacraments may be discussed both as means of grace and virtue (Gnaden und Tugend Mittel), or dogmatically and ethically. If as means of grace, they be observed according to the purpose of their appointment, those who receive them will become partakers of the blessings of the Gospel. As means of virtue, they will have a beneficial effect on the hearts and minds of those who receive them, or are present when they are administered. Both these views are scriptural. They should be administered publicly in the house of God. *Clinic* Communion and *Noth-Taufe* have been practiced to some extent, but neither Luther nor Melancthon approved the practice.

Luther says: "The Holy Ghost works through the word and sacraments. The sacraments are, therefore, necessary and are means of conveying grace to man."—H. L. B.

"Lutherans, while acknowledging the sacraments as signs and memorials, lay *chief* stress upon them as vehicles and bearers of grace through which the Lord comes in contact with the individual soul, imparting to it in baptism the new life and nourishing it in the Holy Supper by the communion of *his* body and blood."—*Lutherans in America*.

"The sacraments are instrumental, not efficient causes of salvation."—*Dr. P. Sahn*.

"The sacraments are means or organs through which God, the Father, wishes to impart and apply his grace: God, the Son, to communicate his merit to believers: God, the Holy Ghost, to exercise his efficacy to the salvation of every one that believeth."—*Chemnitz*.

"The sacraments are not only tokens by which Christians may be outwardly recognized, but signs and testimonies of the divine will towards us, for the purpose of exciting and strengthening faith in those who use them."—*Augs. Conf.*, Art. XIII.

The sacraments are signs, means and seals of grace. They are signs and marks of a Christian profession amongst men. They are also means of grace, signs and evidences of God's good will to man. They are efficacious signs and sure testimonies of God's grace and purpose to us. They are, moreover,

seals of grace. God has promised all believers grace, the pardon of sin, the power of sanctification and the hope of eternal life and ratified the promise with two stately seals, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, water and blood.—1 John 5 : 6.

The General Synod of the United States of America, at York, Pa., 1864, denied any power in the sacraments, *ex opere operato* (by virtue of the act itself), or that the benefits of Baptism and the Lord's Supper can be received without faith.

Luther in his reply to Eck, in 1518, says: "The sacraments of the new law, do not effect the grace they signify, faith is required before the sacraments. The Holy Ghost works only through the word and sacraments, as already stated. The difference between the word of God and the sacraments as means of grace, is this, viz.: The blessings the word of God makes known and offers to us for our acceptance, the sacraments confirm, communicate and seal to the believer. And the Holy Ghost, *when* and *where* it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the Gospel.—*Augs. Conf.*, Art. v.

It is lawful, too, to receive the sacraments, though they be administered by wicked men, since their efficacy does not depend on the moral character of the administrator, but upon the word of God.—*Augs. Conf.*, Art. viii.

The word sacrament, nowhere to be found in the Scriptures, appears to have been in use very early in the Christian Church. The first time it is mentioned, probably, with reference to the Holy Supper, is in the well-known Epistle of Pliny, the Younger, born 61 A. D., to the Emperor Trajan, born 52 A. D. This eminent statesman was appointed Governor of Bithynia, a country in Asia Minor, bordering on the Euxine Sea, where Paul and Silas, and others before them, likely, had preached the Gospel, Acts 16 : 1. Here multitudes had been converted to God. When Pliny came to the government of the province he found many of every age, rank and sex had embraced the Christian religion; for the contagion of this superstition, as Pliny calls it, was not confined to cities only, but had diffused itself through all the neighboring villages and country. Finding that Christianity was gaining ground rapidly, that the temples were deserted, and the ceremonies of the heathen abandoned, he pub-

lished a decree, by order of the emperor, forbidding Christian assemblies on pain of death. The followers of Christ, in consequence of this tyrannical edict, had to relinquish their meetings, very generally, and those which were held were confined to the Sabbath, and then they met *before* day. During this persecution (106 A. D.), there were so many accusations and deaths that the Governor's heart began to relent, and he wrote to the Emperor and asked him for direction, and at the same time stated, succinctly, the sum of the charges which could be substantiated against the Christians. This important piece of church history, so honorable to the followers of Christ and so disgraceful to their persecutors, and in which we find the first mention of the word *sacrament* with reference to the eucharist, is still extant in Pliny's Epistles, Book X., Epist. 97, vol. II., fol. 127.

In the letter referred to, the Christians affirmed that the whole of their *fault* or error was this; that they were accustomed to meet together on a certain day (*stato die*, the Sabbath), *before* daylight, and sing a hymn by turns, (namely, a responsive song to Christ as their God), and to bind themselves by a solemn oath (by a sacrament, *sacramento*), not for any wicked purpose, but not to be guilty of theft, robbery, or adultery; nor to violate their oath, nor to deny any deposit, when called on to deliver it up; having done these things, it was their custom to separate, and afterward re-assemble and eat, in common, an inoffensive meal. There is every reason to believe that Pliny here refers to the Sacrament of the Altar, or the Lord's Supper, and the solemn engagements they entered into with God, when receiving that sacred ordinance, to depart from every appearance of evil; and render up to God, in affectionate obedience, their bodies, souls and spirits.

The word sacrament, not found in Scripture as already stated, is derived etymologically from *sacrare*, and signifies anything set apart as sacred, consecrated, a sum deposited, a pledge, a soldier's oath, anything devoted to a divinity, a solemn obligation or engagement. The word *sacramentum* is often met with in deeds, charters and legal documents, signifying an oath; which in swearing, the person laid his hand on the Holy Gospels. The promise then made was considered a holy obligation, which he

was bound at all events to perform. Hence as there was a continual reference to the sacramentum, or military oath, the blessed ordinance of the eucharist itself appears to have been termed the sacrament, because in it the followers of Christ took the vows of the Lord upon them; and as often as they celebrated this sacred ordinance, they ratified the covenant engagements which they had made at their baptism.

The ecclesiastical use of the term, however, does not seem to come through this channel. The Christian Church fathers employed the word sacramentum as a translation of the Greek *μυστήριον*, for any solemn religious rite, or ceremony, especially involving mysteries, and applied it even to the whole of Christianity. It is thus used in the Vulgate and other Latin translations for *μυστήριον*, and signifies the holy mysteries of our religion, Eph. 3 : 3 and 9; 5 : 32; 1 Tim. 3 : 16. Tertullian, who probably died A. D. 220, was the first to apply it to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, using sacramentum with reference to these Christian ordinances. For a considerable length of time, however, the word was used with great latitude of meaning. Cyprian, indeed, speaks of a sacrament of the Lord's Supper and also of a sacrament of the Trinity and even calls the Lord's Prayer a sacrament.—Hagenbach, Vol. I., fol. 212. Augustine says, a sacrament is the visible word (*visibile verbum*). This view is approved by Lutheran divines. Melancthon says in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, Art. VII: The word and the external signs work the same thing in our hearts; as Augustine well says, a sacrament is the *visible* word. It is a sort of picture, or representation of what the word announces; and hence the office of both is the same. Apology, Art. VII. As the word enters our ears, so the external signs are placed before our eyes, inwardly, to excite and move the heart to faith.

Quenstedt says: To the word of the Gospel, God has added, as it were, another medium of his saving grace, to wit, the sacraments, which are the visible word, IV., 73. And this agrees with Art. XIII., of the Augsburg Confession, which says of the sacraments, they are signs and evidences of the goodwill of God towards us, for the purpose of exciting and confirming the

faith of those who use them. The Council of Trent defines a sacrament as follows, viz., It is something presented to the sense, which has the power by divine appointment not only of signifying, but also of efficiently conveying grace to those who do not place an obstacle thereunto. The celebrated Dr. Mosheim says: A sacrament is an ordinance appointed of God by which the benefits purchased by the Saviour, are not only symbolically represented to the senses, but spiritual blessings are also actually conferred on them who use them.

Hutter in his *Compend.*, fol. 124, says: "A sacrament is a holy ordinance, appointed of God, which consists of an element, or outward sign, together with divine grace, by which God not only signifies and seals the Gospel's peculiar promise of grace, that is, the gracious forgiveness of sins, but also, through these outward signs, exhibits and really imparts the heavenly benefits promised in each sacrament respectively at its institution, so that each one partaking in faith, is thereby assured of saving acceptance with God."

Luther defined a sacrament as follows: It is an observance appointed by God in which one makes use of a visible thing, which has the divine word of command and of promise.

A sacrament is a divine ordinance instituted by Christ himself, in which by means of an outward and visible sign, grace is imparted to man, or if already possessed, he is assured thereof. Hence Melancthon says: Sacraments are signs and ceremonies which God has commanded and which have a promise of grace subjoined, Ap. Art., XII. And again in Art. XII., he says, a sacrament is a ceremony, or external sign by which God bestows that which the divine promise affixed to the ceremony, offers.

A sacrament consists of two parts, viz.: First, the outward and visible thing (*res terrestris*), which affects the senses, as the bread, wine and water; and, secondly, the invisible thing (*res coelestis*), which is typified and imparted by the external sign. It requires three things, namely, first, God's promise of the pardon of sin; secondly, the emphatic command that it shall be observed in the Church to the end of time; and, thirdly, a visible sign ordained of God that the promised grace may be

obtained through it by the worthy participant. Other definitions have been given, differing somewhat according as a wider or narrower signification was designed and different shades of meaning have prevailed, but want of space will not allow their presentation in detail. To institute sacraments is an act of Christ's regal power and royal authority. And the anointed Son of God has appointed religious rites and ceremonies, by which certain spiritual blessings are not only represented, but actually communicated. He who was baptized of John in Jordan with water, and with a baptism of blood on the cross, instituted the holy sacraments, in order to the sanctification, purification and preservation of believers in the true faith unto everlasting life. They are natural, simple, and universally applicable. One is called the sacrament of initiation, the other the sacrament of confirmation.—*Ammon.*

Baptism is also called the sacrament of regeneration, and the Lord's Supper the sacrament of sanctification. For according to Martensen, the order of salvation consists in regeneration and sanctification. And St. John says: This is *he* which came by water and blood, not by water only, as though the Saviour had instituted but one sacrament, but by water and blood. The apostle refers to a miracle on the cross after the Lord had commended his soul into the hands of his heavenly Father, and then died, to wit, the piercing of his side by a soldier, to determine whether he was dead or had only fainted, when blood and water flowed out for a miraculous confirmation of the sacraments of the New Testament, in which ordinances the blessed Christ still comes to man, renewing the heart and sanctifying the soul.

The reasons why God instituted the sacraments are, his grace and man's weakness. God from the beginning hath dealt two ways with mankind, viz.: By his word and external visible signs connected with his promises in order to their salvation. Because human reason cannot grasp the word and promise of God, he has made it comprehensible and visible, and connected therewith his promise of grace. Hence the *verbum visibile*, visible word of Augustine. A few illustrations will render this aspect of our subject intelligible. The sign and seal of the covenant, God made with Noah, that he would no more destroy the world

with a deluge of waters, that seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, should not cease, was the rainbow. Gen. 8 : 22 ; 9 : 12.

To the covenant God made with Abraham, that in him all the nations of earth should be blessed, the seal of circumcision was affixed. Gen. 17 : 10.

The token and seal of the covenant God made with Moses, to deliver the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, was the splendid miracles Moses wrought with his staff, by which Israel might know and believe that God sent him to deliver them. Ex. 3 : 12 ; 4 : 31.

The promise to give the land of Canaan to the Israelites for a possession, was sealed to them by the pillar of cloud and fire. The sign and seal of the promise of deliverance from Egyptian bondage, was the sacrament of the passover.

The promise of healing to those bitten by fiery serpents, was sealed to the Israelites with the brazen serpent.

The promise of God to dwell among the Israelites, was sealed with the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat.

All the promises of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, were sealed by the sacrifices of the Old Testament.

The manifold purifications by water and the sanctification of the people by blood, signified the blood of Christ to cleanse them from sin. Thus all the gracious promises of pardon, righteousness and eternal life, God, because of our weakness, has sealed with the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—sometimes called mysteries, because we cannot tell how God works in and through them. The blessed Christ himself has instituted for his Church these two sacraments, Baptism and the Holy Supper, with reference to his redemption. For baptism is a laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, in which, by virtue of the divine word, we are washed and cleansed from sin. And in the sacrament of the altar, the Lord himself assures us that he shed his blood for the remission of our sins. Truly sacred ordinances at once honor the Lord and are means of grace to the souls of men.

The Lord Jesus Christ himself instituted *ONLY two* sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Romish Church holds

that there are seven sacraments, viz., Baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, confirmation, ordination, penance and extreme unction. Protestants generally hold to but two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. There are, properly speaking, *but two Christian Sacraments*, to wit, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.—*Hutter's Comp.*, 126.

Note carefully, first, that only these two have any show of being instituted by Christ as sacraments; secondly, to these alone, as such, are the promises of God's grace attached. The command for baptism is this, namely, Baptize all nations, Matt. 28 : 19. The promise is: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, Mark 16 : 16. The external sign is water. The command for the Lord's Supper is this, namely: This do in remembrance of me, Luke 22 : 19. The promise of grace is, The blood of Christ is shed *for you* for the remission of sins. The external signs ordained by Christ himself are bread and wine. The sufferings of Christ are a confirmation of these two sacraments. For as the Lord's side opened on the cross, blood and water issued forth. These were the two sacraments, which flowed from the wounds of Christ on Calvary. For what St. John says in his first epistle, fifth chapter, fifth and sixth verses, corroborates this view, namely, This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by *water and blood*. Also in the eighth verse he says, There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the water and the blood, and these three are one. The types and shadows of the Old Testament sanction the opinion that there are only two sacraments. Circumcision and the divers washings and purifications of the Old Testament evidently typified Baptism, and the passover and the numerous sacrifices of the Old Testament prefigured the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and, consequently, the Holy Supper, in which we enjoy the benefits of this sacrifice. There are two points of difference between the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments. First the ceremonies were different. In the Old Testament there was the sacrament of circumcision, which has been abolished and Baptism instituted in its stead. There was also the Jewish passover which has been fulfilled and abrogated by Christ and superseded by the Lord's

Supper, and we no longer eat the paschal lamb figuratively, but the true passover sacrificed for us, as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 5 : 7, Even Christ *our* passover is sacrificed for us. Secondly, there was also a difference of signification. The sacraments of the Old Testament signified that the Messiah would come and suffer and die for the salvation of the world; the sacraments of the New Testament testify that the Messiah has come and atoned for our sins, and are no longer figures and signs as in the Old Testament, but convey to us the *treasure* itself: they are no longer a shadow of good things to come, but bring us the *substance* itself. The design of the sacraments is fourfold, namely, (1) to signify to all the great truths they represent, (2) to be a means of communicating the blessings signified, (3) to seal to believers their interest in the great salvation. Accordant with this view, they are means of grace, even as the word of God is, and are appointed by God for this purpose. For Christ himself says, John 3 : 5, except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. And again he says: Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, Matt. 28 : 19; Mark 16 : 16. (4) They serve also as a badge of distinction between the Church and the world—as marks of a Christian profession amongst men. Aug. Conf., Art. XIII.

As to the efficacy of the sacraments there has been, and still is, considerable difference of opinion. These differences have widely separated professing Christians, and are *now* one of the chief points of controversy among Protestant Christians.

Roman Catholics hold that the sacraments do actually convey to the recipient, not opposing them by positive resistance, the grace they signify—that faith is not requisite to the proper use of the sacraments, but that they confer grace merely by their observance (*ex opere operato*), without a good disposition on the part of the person using them; all of which the Lutheran Church condemns. Apology, Augs. Conf., Art. vii., fol. 267. Zwingli held that the sacraments simply signify or represent the truth symbolically. This is the lowest view and the opposite

extreme from the Romish view, and was opposed as well by Calvin as by Luther and Melancthon. Lutherans maintain that the sacraments not only signify, or represent, but are means of conveying the grace signified and are also seals divinely appointed, of that grace. This makes them more than outward symbols merely. They are instruments or means of grace and seals of the covenant. This grace is not ascribed to the bare operation of the sacramental elements, but to the power of the Holy Ghost, who accompanies these divine ordinances and their use in the exercise of faith. Luther says the sacraments were instituted to excite, nourish, strengthen, increase and preserve faith, so that whether in the promise naked, or in the promise in the vesture of the sacramental rite, it may grasp and accept salvation, namely, the pardon of sin, the power of sanctification and the hope of eternal glory. There is no virtue in the sacraments apart from the grace of the Father, the merit of the Son and the efficacy of the Holy Ghost. God, the Father, is the fountal cause of salvation; God, the Son, is the meritorious cause, the Holy Ghost is the efficient cause, and faith is the *active* means of salvation.

Faith does not seek some virtue or efficacy in the outward elements themselves, but in the promises annexed to the sacraments it seeks, lays hold on and receives the grace of the Father, the merit of the Son and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit. There is no power in the sacraments as an *opus operatum*, the benefits of Baptism and the Lord's Supper can not be received without faith. Indeed the *object* of faith is the *word and sacraments*. For in the *word and sacraments* the true object of faith is the grace of God, the merit of Christ and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, (Chemnitz). Faith justifies, therefore, because it lays hold of *those things* in the word and sacraments. There is an important distinction to be made between instrumental and efficient causes of salvation.

The sacraments do not necessarily convey grace. (1) Many who receive and use them are destitute of such grace, *e. g.* Simon Magus, Gibbon and Hume. (2) Faith is essential to their efficacy. For, says St. Paul, circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy cir-

cumcision is made uncircumcision. He is therefore a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is *that* of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. Rom. 2 : 25, 29. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature, faith which worketh by love. Gal. 5 : 6 ; 6 : 15. And (3) their value in Scripture, is made to depend entirely on a worthy and proper use. Paul says: Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. 1 Cor. 11 : 27, 29. See also Rom. 2 : 25, 28, 29; Col. 3 : 11. Hence Luther says in the Smaller Catechism: The words *for you*, require truly believing hearts, and in the Larger Catechism, he says, Without faith baptism is of no benefit, nor can it receive any blessing.

Are the sacraments necessary then? some one will say. They are not necessary in the sense that God could not dispense with them, or save without them. They are not necessary in the sense that the atonement, or justification, or regeneration, &c., is necessary, but they are necessary in the sense that Christ has commanded them. They are necessary as divine commands for us to obey and keep. This is plain from Matt. 28 : 19—Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Also from 1 Cor. 11 : 23, 24, 25, where it is written: The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. And *further* it was the practice of the apostles and early Christians to walk in these ordinances, to observe them regularly. They are necessary as a part of the means of grace appointed and adopted to save the soul, *e. g.*, the word of God and the living ministry. So that without these, religion never has and more than likely never will prosper. But they are not necessary in the sense that no

one can be saved without them, or that God's grace is so inseparably united with them, that it cannot be communicated, except through them. God is not bound to means—he can work without them, but man is, if he have them. It is, however, not the neglect of means, but the contempt of them that damns. If then, Baptism and the Lord's Supper are of divine authority and accompanied with special promises, as is evident from the word of God, the proper observance of them must necessarily be accompanied with great advantages and valuable benefits. As man is not a mere spirit, but a being of reason and sense, the sacraments being sensible exhibitions of the truths of religion, will, in a general way, appeal to his senses, excite and sustain his devotion, and strengthen his zeal and piety. But they are especially beneficial: (1) As seals and pledges of God's grace in Christ Jesus. For Paul calls circumcision a seal of righteousness, Rom. 4 : 11. And 1 Peter 3 : 21 calls baptism the answer of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. (2) They are means and instruments by which God works in us efficaciously and applies his grace to us in an especial manner. For he who has been baptized, has this consolation, that God has made a covenant with him, particularly, and purified him by the blood of Christ and the washing of water by the word (by water and the Holy Ghost), that he may obtain eternal life. For St. Paul emphatically says: He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, Tit. 3 : 5. He who goes worthily to the Lord's Supper, has this consolation *also* that Christ gives him individually his body and blood as a pledge and assurance of his salvation. (3) By the sacraments we, too, make known our Christianity, that we are *real* members of the true Church, which is the body of Christ. (4) Further the sacraments awaken our hearts to prayer, gratitude and earnest meditation on the sufferings and death of Christ. (5) And besides they obligate us to mutual love; for in baptism, we are all baptized into one body, and in the Lord's Supper we all eat and drink into one body, 1 Cor. 10 : 17. We are one body, because we are all partakers of one bread, and we are by one *Spirit* baptized into one body and have been all made drink into one Spirit, 1 Cor. 12 : 13.

We are all one in Christ, who by baptism were admitted into the Church, and this reciprocal union, is testified and declared by our communion at the Lord's table, which is, by Paul, called a drinking into one Spirit, that is, we drink one sacrament, that we may receive one Spirit, and we receive one baptism that we may be one body (the Church). Certainly, then, those are in error who sneeringly ask: What can it benefit any one to have a little water sprinkled on him, or to eat a *little* bread and drink a little wine? Manifestly there would be no use in this, if the sacraments were not of divine appointment.

But the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, Art. III., does justice to all errorists, in which the confessors positively declare: We reject and condemn the entire mass of scholastic errors, which teach that any careless partaker of the sacrament, if only he does not positively resist, receives *ex opere operato* (by virtue of the act itself), the grace and favor of God, even without good motives, or faith in his heart. To hold that we are justified by a mere ceremony, or external work, is plainly a Jewish error. Hence we declare that faith is essential to the right use of the sacraments, a faith which believes the divine promises and accepts the offers of grace, which are presented in the word and sacraments. This is the only use of the sacraments upon which we can confidently rely; for no one can embrace the promises of God, but by faith alone; the sacraments are outward signs and certifications of the promises, therefore, there must be faith for a proper use of them. All who have not true faith, are in error and can not receive the sacraments to good purpose. Now, in conclusion, there are two words which should be carefully distinguished from each other namely, *sacramental* and *sacrificial*—the former denotes what God brings to us, the spiritual gifts and blessings; the latter denotes what we bring to God, prayer, praise, thanksgiving, &c. There are also four tests of a sacrament, it would be well to remember, to wit: First, there must be something visible and adapted to symbolize religious truth. Secondly, it should be of divine appointment, *i. e.*, it should have the authority of God for its observance. Thirdly, it should be the means of conferring saving grace. Fourthly, it should be of perpetual obliga-

tion through all ages of the Church militant on earth. Only two religious rites abide these tests and are, therefore, properly speaking, sacraments. Feet-washing is no sacrament as it confers no spiritual benefit upon those who practice it. Marriage is no sacrament, though of divine appointment, as it confers no spiritual graces on those who receive it. So also of confirmation and ordination; they are important ceremonies of the Church, but according to the *criteria* for judging what are sacraments and what are not, they are not entitled to rank as such among church ordinances. Baptism is initial and introductory in its nature, and hence it is administered but once. Once admitted to the Church, however, the Christian requires the aid of another sacrament to impart to his spirit continued support and spiritual food. As baptism is necessarily the initiatory, so the holy supper is the confirmatory, or conservative sacrament. For religion does not simply consist in entering the Church of God, but in the continued growth and improvement of the soul in every good word and work. Hence the importance and value of the Lord's Supper, which is intended for constant repetition as long as the child of God has wants and dangers. Christians should always be mindful of the fact that the sacraments are essential marks of the Church and prove to the world who are the followers of Christ and who are not. This all who receive these religious rites should remember. By their reception, the members of the Church are identified, and they are separated, thereby, from the world at large.

The sacred writers term the sacraments mysteries; and the word is fully applicable to them when we remember that in holy baptism, Christ grants his sanctifying grace to all those who worthily receive it, thereby renewing their spirits; and that in the holy supper, Christ is specially, supernaturally and incomprehensibly present, to grant to the worthy communicant the forgiveness of sins, and the renewed and direct consolations of his grace. (Read Eph. 3 : 3, 9, and 5 : 32; and 1 Tim. 3 : 16). This is all mystery. But true religion cannot exist without mysteries; mysteries which require our faith, and are above and beyond our reason, but not contrary to it. Those, therefore, who would expunge them altogether from the Christian reli-

gion, either in its *doctrinal* or *ritual* part, aim a blow at the existence and life of Christianity itself. Finally, if the word of God be a divine revelation, and the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God, there must be *something* in the sacraments. They can not be *mere* ceremony from which the mind can derive no instruction and the heart no profit.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE STUDENT PUBLISHING COMPANY, HARTFORD, CONN., U. S. A.

The Church and the Age. Being a study of the Age, and of the adaptation of the Church to its needs. By J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D. D.

The three questions, which this book seeks to answer, are: "*What is the Age?*" "*What is its Church?*" "*What ought the Church to be?*" After a thoughtful and comprehensive introduction on the "Principles of Investigation," the questions are answered in chapters with the following titles: "Characteristics of the Age;" "Religion and Theology of the Age;" "The Church;" "The Adaptation of the Church to the Times;" "Protestantism and Catholicism;" "The Church and Culture;" "The Church and Socialism;" "The Outlook." Then follows an Appendix on "The study of the Age."

It is difficult to characterize this book. Did space permit we would allow the author an opportunity to speak for himself to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*. But the reader of the *QUARTERLY* who will not himself read the book, from beginning to end, will do himself an injustice. We believe that no other book in existence exhibits so fully, fairly, thoroughly, and impartially, the present religious, moral, theological and social characteristics of Europe. The author writes of what he knows to exist. There are passages which look as though the writer is a pessimist. There are other passages which seem to indicate a philosophical and religious optimism. But these seemingly contradictory passages are simply the shadows and lights of a powerful delineation. The picture is severely true. We do *know* things to exist in Germany as Dr. Stuckenberg has described them. Atheism, Socialism, Ultramontanism, have a powerful hold upon the Fatherland at this time, and are in contact at various points for the overthrow of Protestantism. But a new generation of men is coming to the front. The true Church of Jesus Christ, the spiritual society of believers, is growing in magnitude and influence. The outlook is hopeful.

The book is written in a clear and strong style. It is a product of thorough study and of courageous convictions. We commend it to every person who would understand the diverse, and antagonistic, and conspiring factors which are operating to bring about the greatest revolution in the history of mankind,—a revolution which is going on daily, which may be completed peacefully, but which is far more likely to deluge Europe with blood.

J. W. R.

MACMILLAN AND CO., NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Evolution of Religion. By Edward Caird, LL. D., D. C. L. Two vols.

These remarkable volumes are the result of a course of Gifford Lectures delivered by the distinguished Glasgow professor at the University of St. Andrews. In the early days of the Hibbert foundation it was said by one of the eminent lecturers of that course, where the line of scholarly inquiry is much the same, that the man above all others qualified to speak with authority on all that pertains to religion, philosophically and historically considered, was Professor Edward Caird. These two volumes on the "*Evolution of Religion*" will abundantly sustain the estimate put upon the author's wealth of resource, and breadth of comprehension, in dealing with the whole question of religion under the newer aspects suggested by the scientific solicitations and promptings of our times. We are hardly mistaken when we predict for them a world-wide interest, and an intellectual satisfaction quite unprecedented in discussions of this kind.

The comparative study of religion, of all religions, under the guiding principle of development, or "evolution," as the author interchangeably expresses it, has been going on industriously for some years past, and the great specialists in this line have practically opened out for Christendom a new world of devout scholarly interest in quarters where hopeless oblivion, or still more hopeless ignorance and superstition, were thought to be supreme. The aim of these volumes is to gather up the results of these researches under some comprehensive principle that shall be the scientific basis for religion as a form of the universal consciousness of mankind, "the expression of man's ultimate attitude to the universe." And this is found not in "any one quality or characteristic which is common to all religions; for in his religious life man has sounded the whole gamut of possible forms of consciousness, from the highest inspiration to the lowest superstition"—not in the earliest forms of religion as the schools of positivism have so confidently presumed,—but in man's conception of the infinite being as the evolution of the religious consciousness has finally brought it out.

This is the key-note to this remarkable discussion, and will be found to be of thrilling interest, not simply as a working hypothesis for the historical tracing of the development of religion in the second volume,

but for its intrinsic speculative value in correcting the partial and inadequate solutions of the religious problem so imposingly put forth by Prof. Max Müller and Mr. Herbert Spencer. The idea of God, or the the Infinite, is, indeed, at the root of all religion, but what kind of an Infinite? The Infinite as a mere "beyond," as conceived by Max Müller, or as the "Unknowable" of the reigning agnostic philosophy of our day? Most triumphantly does our author show that the Infinite arrived at by abstraction is, as the Germans call it, "a false or bad infinite" leading logically and inevitably to the negation of all religion, and, therefore, appearing nowhere in the historical development of the religious consciousness of the race.

Presumptively evolution, to be a process at all, must proceed upon some principle of unfolding more and more apparent as the higher stages are attained, and not, as the current agnostic theories would imply, evanescing at last into the undiscoverable inane. Evidently the only God it is possible to worship is one who manifests himself in nature and in spirit, "more clearly in spirit than in nature, and most clearly in all the highest developments of the intellectual and moral life of man." Such a God comes more distinctively into consciousness, as the evolution of religion advances, as the world matures, the conscious life of man being always circumscribed by "three ideas," indissolubly interlacing with each other, the idea of *nature* and *spirit* confronting and opposing each other, and that of *God* as the all-comprehending and unifying principle and life of the whole. Inchoately, and by implication, this stupendous formula presides over the earliest and crudest manifestations of the religious impulse, and distinctly articulates itself in the highest, and is, therefore, the thread in the hands of the scientific explorer in the labyrinth of the religions of the world.

With this clue the task of the investigator is plain—to trace the evolving consciousness of God through the earlier *objective* forms of religion, forms that are sensuous, materialistic, and anthropomorphic gross nature-religions, through intermediate forms and higher anticipations, into the *subjective* religions, which earliest appear in the religion of Israel, and come to consummate development in the religion of Jesus, and the Christian philosophy and theology of the subsequent time. In general outline this is the scope of the first volume, and it is not extravagant to say that it easily takes rank as one of the most brilliant intellectual achievements of our time, and marks a reaction, at full tide, in philosophic circles, against the agnostic theories of religion which have of late so pervasively and disastrously swayed the English mind.

But the interest culminates in the second volume, where the religion of Jesus is to represent the highest phase in the development of subjective religion, and where it shall be the task of the writer to show

how Christianity grew out of the despairing subjectivism of Judaism, and supplied a seed of subsequent development which gives it the right to be considered the universal religion of the race. The discussion here is in the highest degree stimulating, because we are to witness the application of the scientific formula of evolution to a religion we have been wont to regard as so essentially supernatural, as so thoroughly condensed and epitomized in the transcendent fact of the Incarnation, that we instinctively draw back from a conclusion for which we have been so persuasively prepared.

And at last there may be good ground for withholding our unqualified assent. But, in the meantime, it may be well for the reader to remember that the kind of evolution to which the religion of Jesus, as in like manner all other religions are made to conform, is not the materialistic evolution of which the science of our day is so prompt to speak, but an evolution that witnesses the historical progress of the conception of God from the limitations and crudeness of the outside objective world, to the more adequate forms of the inside world or spirit, thence upward until the soul is face to face with its infinite all-inclusive source.

On the other hand our Lord has indicated clearly the organic connection of his spiritual kingdom with the Mosaic system going before it, in the declaration that he came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fill them out, as likewise he has stated the law of evolution for his kingdom, under the analogy of the sprouting corn, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, and of the mustard seed, smallest of all seeds, growing to be a tree on which the birds of the air will build their nests.

Development, therefore, is the forestalled law of the religion of Jesus, and it is simply a question as to whether Mr. Caird has not taken unwarranted liberties with it, in so fixing Christianity within the limits of scientific formula, as to allow but little room for the supernatural characteristic of it as currently understood. It is evident that the three ideas, the world, the self, and God, all in organic union within the immanent embrace of the all-inclusive life of God—this taken as a clue to the history and philosophy of the Christian religion, carries with it a faint suggestion of pantheism, in so far as the unifying principle, the infinite, is conceived of as settling itself over the contradictions of the finite in the atmosphere of an eternal calm. More than once in the great ethnic religions has pantheism come to be the controlling element, and our author has reckoned upon these as transitional forms leading from the crudeness of objective religions to the religion of the spirit. But what if Mr. Caird's formula should so bind up the highest of all spiritual religions to the circumscribed round of the *three ideas*, as to admit of no free movement upon the finite from the eternal world—such, for example, as miracle would imply, or that large and imposing phenomenon in

the life of Christ of demoniacal possessions, the irruption of malign powers upon the bodies of men?

It must be conceded that Mr. Caird's theory of the "divine immanence" struggles most at this point, as will be seen in the note appended to his lecture on "Pessimism and Optimism," taken in connection with allusions to the same subject in lecture sixth, on "The Religion of Jesus." Indeed the author does not shrink from the application of his formula to all the facts and teachings of the New Testament Scriptures as to the person and mission of our Lord—making no new renderings for himself, but, obviously, finding in the more advanced theological thinking of our times an atmosphere in which all his own high rendering may most congenially move.

In the end we get the impression that no vital element in the religion of Jesus is sacrificed, and that the thread the author put into our hands to guide us in exploring the mysterious history of the religions of mankind, though often taut, has never snapped, and that we emerge from the discussion with our vision greatly enlarged, and with new and powerful promptings to enter these rich fields of investigation for ever increasing measures of assurance of the reality, and universality, and supreme glory of the religious heritage we possess. W. H. W.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Christian Worship. Its Principles and Forms. By J. W. Richard, D. D., and Rev. F. V. N. Painter, A. M. Published for the authors.

The appearance of this book has been awaited with a good deal of interest in the English portion of the Lutheran Church in America. The increasing attention given to liturgics and especially the liturgics of the Lutheran Church, together with the reputation of the authors, has prepared the Church generally, to welcome it as a production bringing information needed and desired on a subject of great importance to the Christian public, as to the best and most edifying exercises entering into Christian worship.

We will say of it at once, it is a book not only to be read, but also to be studied. It contains a large amount of the history of worship, and the liturgical forms principally prevailing at different periods and in different conditions of the Church, showing how the Christian life,—or, it may be, merely the *church* life in some periods, sought to express its devotions and its aspirations in public assemblies. In this respect it is exceedingly suggestive to those who desire to dig down to the under-flowing currents of religious thought and emotion prevailing in the Christian community of the past.

The Introduction deals with man as an instinctive worshiper, even without a divine revelation, but needing a revelation, to worship truly, intelligently and profitably. It then goes on to unfold the principles and constituents of Christian worship, as they have appeared in various

stages and conditions of the Church's progress. The simple forms of worship prevailing in apostolic days were in accordance with Col. 3: 17, "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord." Simple as those forms were, yet they had their effect, and from the exhortation of the apostle cited above, were intended to have the effect of both instruction and edification in the congregational and personal life of the Christians of that time, thus clearly demonstrating the advantages of suitable forms in which the people should speak unto God and to each other in their assemblies.

Enough is given to enable the student to take a very intelligent view, not only of the manner, in which that which was intended for the public worship of God, was conducted, but also of the extent, to which the true spirit of Christian worship prevailed, or had been lost, at different periods.

Several things are noteworthy in the making up of the book.

First, the extent to which Luther is permitted to speak on the manner in which Christian worship is to be observed, so that it may best attain its purpose. In his own full, free, forcible and judicious style, Luther gives directions how we may most profitably engage in the worship of God.

Few men have ever possessed so devout a spirit as Luther, or were by their native gifts and temperament, and by their personal experiences, so well qualified to speak authoritatively on everything connected with or entering into Christian worship. Hence one reads his thoughts with special interest and profit. The authors have done well in giving us so much of Luther on the subject of their book.

Another thing that arrests the attention of the reader. Whilst the book is not ostensibly controversial, yet it seems to have been wrought out under what may be termed a controversial consciousness. That is, it has been prepared under the influence of the liturgical sensitiveness for several years prevailing within the General Synod, and which found expression quite freely in the journals of the Church of the General Synod. And as it contains so many allusions to the liberty in the forms of worship, accorded to the churches in different localities and so fully sanctioned by Luther himself, it is quite natural for us to infer, or at least suspect, that it was designed to operate against the growing tendency to the use of the "Common Service" in some of our congregations. It is not indeed declared in terms direct or indirect, that this traditional liberty is imperiled in the churches of the General Synod. But the frequency with which attention is called to such liberty in the Lutheranism of the past, looks much like a constructive notification to the Church that there is a design in some quarters to force upon the Church what she does not want and what would be detrimental to her spiritual development. If it be true, that the authors wrote and

selected with such a view, it is enough to say, that they have very much mistaken the intentions of the friends of the "Common Service." Furthermore a careful study of this book will lead one to regard the "Common Service" with a larger measure of favor; so that the friends of that service have little if any thing to fear from what may seem to be antagonisms in it.

We say therefore, let the book be read, extensively read and studied. It will be helpful to the pastor and the layman. It will enable them to form right views of what Christian worship ought to be, by an acquaintance with the good and the evil that have entered into the devotional forms of the Church heretofore. And we believe that it will aid our people in coming to a proper adjustment of our more recent misunderstandings.

E. M.

The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. pp. 193.

It is somewhat embarrassing to review a book which is doubtless already in the hands of most of our readers, and comments upon which have already been general and on the whole very favorable. Of the importance and the timeliness of the work, and of the ability and representative character of the respective authors we have heard but one opinion. Their contributions have indeed not been submitted to their respective bodies, and it is not certain that each writer would have the unanimous endorsement of those for whom he speaks, but these theologians are recognized as competent to speak in a representative capacity, and moreover as able to write something that can stand on its own merits, and for which they can afford to be "alone responsible."

Whoever made the selection we can hardly conceive of a different or a better choice than that of Dr. Loy for the Joint Synod of Ohio, Dr. Valentine for the General Synod, Dr. Fritschel for the German Iowa Synod, Dr. Jacobs for the General Council, Prof. Pieper for the Synodical Conference, and Dr. Horn for the United Synod in the South. We regard it as a defect of the book and an act of injustice not to publish along with the names of these writers, the name of the lay member of the Board who suggested this publication. He hath wrought a good work and deserves to be remembered for it by the whole Lutheran Church. The grandeur and the importance of his suggestion will grow with the constant growth of a Church that is rapidly moving to the front of American Christianity.

It is the judgment of enlightened men in all the churches that "the Lutherans ought to get together," as an eminent theologian puts it. There is a wide-spread feeling within the Church, a feeling ever increasing intensively and extensively, that with our precious faith we ought to act in concert for the salvation of the nation, and that coöperative or united activity would make the Lutheran Church the most powerful re-

ligious factor in this country,—a view that is not confined to Lutheran minds,—but we find ourselves broken into at least half a dozen divisions, and it must be confessed that comparatively few understand the cause or the origin of these divisions, and fewer still, perhaps, recognize the need or the justification of their perpetuation.

What could be more important, therefore, than this brief yet comprehensive statement of the distinctive doctrines and usages of the General Bodies, showing what each stands for, exhibiting the extent of their differences, and enabling the reader also to see the degree of their unity even though this is not directly brought out, not having fallen within the purview of the work. To turn on the light is certainly the first step in every good work, and if nothing further were intended than simply to publish to the Church and to the world where these bodies respectively stand and why they stand where they do, an incalculable gain to the cause of truth must be registered by the appearance of this little book.

But whatever may have been the scope of the intention, the result will take a much wider sweep. When the light is turned on men not only find what they were looking for, but very often make discoveries of which they had not dreamed before. Questions that have quite lately perplexed some minds among us, find here an answer so lucid, so scriptural and so conclusive as to make further controversy regarding them superfluous. Moreover when we shall once clearly understand the real differences which separate Lutherans, and shall justly represent to ourselves and to others instead of misrepresenting them, the first stage in the prospect of a united Church will have been reached.

If those who speak for the other branches of the Church have given as general satisfaction to their brethren, as the representative of the General Synod has to those of his own body, they may well felicitate themselves on their success. Only those whose age has led them to forget the fate of the Definite Platform, and a few whose youth is the excuse for their not having learned it, can find any objection to the claim that the Augsburg Confession, without anything being taken away from its teaching, or anything being added to it, "becomes the statement of the doctrinal position and teaching of the General Synod." As the Editor of the *Independent* put it after reading the book, "The General Synod accepts the Confession and all that the Confession teaches." Candor demands also that the General Synod presentation be commended for the admission, justified by 70 years of its history, that "the General Synod allows full liberty to persons within it to accept *for themselves* any or all of the special doctrinal views, even down to the minutest particulars, of the rest of the so-called Symbols." It might have been added "and to teach or preach any or all," &c., but this is implied.

Candor at the same time constrains us to voice the general comment

on the omission of the principal and positive clause in the York resolutions repudiating the Definite Platform. The keystone to that deliverance is, "Before God and his Church, we declare that in our judgment, the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistency with this our testimony, and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified." This keystone is wanting in the discussion of the doctrinal basis, although the explanation of which it forms a part, "must be regarded as part of the General Synod's doctrinal position," and, as we are told on p. 45, "the Augsburg Confession is no 'negative' exhibition of Christianity"—neither is the York explanation mere negation.

There has also been considerable criticism over the fact that while the General Synod was organized to "unite the different synods in fellowship and work" and has consistently maintained up to the present this cardinal feature, there should not be in this presentation a solitary reference to the preparation of the Common Service, the only example thus far of union in any form of church work or fellowship among the General bodies. The General Synod is entitled to no small measure of credit for the successful accomplishment of this joint-Lutheran work, and any paper setting forth its claims, should assert for it this glory, a glory not diminished by the struggle it has cost the General Synod to maintain consistently the stand for unity and uniformity it had taken so unanimously and so enthusiastically. If, as we are told, "a general uniformity is felt to be desirable," the part taken by the General Synod, in accordance with its characteristic principles, to bring about general uniformity should not be omitted from an *exposé* of its claims and its merits.

We would yet suggest that a careful index would be a most valuable addition to this book.

E. J. W.

History of the Seventy-fifth Regiment of Indiana Infantry Volunteers, its Organization, Campaigns and Battles (1862-65). By Rev. David Bittle Floyd, A. M., (formerly a Sergeant in Company "I" of the Regiment). With an Introduction by Major-General J. J. Reynolds, (Provisional Colonel of the Regiment). Published for the Author. Cloth binding, pp. 457, \$2.00 post paid.

There is something peculiarly fascinating about the history of our civil war, whether it comes from the one side or the other. This is true whether it is a general history of the war, or the relation a single prominent leader bore to it, or the account of a special campaign, or the history of a single organization. We have examples of all these different kinds and all are eagerly read. The book in hand is the history of a single regiment, and that, too, of one of a distant State; and yet it soon wins the attention of the reader and he finds himself as much interested as if reading a captivating story of fiction.

But it is not simply the story of camp and battle that gives value to this handsome volume. The author has gone to exceptional pains in giving historical data down to last details, and thus has made the book an invaluable one as a record of the regiment of which it treats. Not only are the officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, noticed, but the private soldiers also—whoever did a heroic deed or suffered death on the field or in hospital, or lost a limb or received a wound. The roster at the close of the book is as complete as faithful and assiduous effort could possibly make it. A member of the regiment could not ask for anything more than is given here.

But, whilst it is professedly and chiefly a history of a particular regiment, it is more. It gives sketches of all the regiments associated with it, and while it gives the regiment's part in the campaigns in which it served, it incidentally gives the history of the campaigns themselves. In this respect it is, in many instances, more satisfactory than the accounts of the campaigns as given in the general histories of the war.

We congratulate the author on the manifest success of his effort. It deserves to rank as a model for regimental histories, and hence we are not surprised to learn that it has been thus used already by other authors who are endeavoring to give complete histories of their regiments. It is gotten out in excellent style by the Lutheran Publication Society.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, PHILADELPHIA.

Lectures on the Gospels and Epistles for the Minor Festivals of the Church Year. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D. pp. 8vo. 519.

The completion of his four volumes of *Lectures on the Gospels and Epistles for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Church Year* by an additional volume on the Gospels and Epistles appointed for the Minor Festivals, is just what might have been expected from the author's indefatigable industry and clever methods. He leaves nothing incomplete. "While the Minor Festivals commemorating the lives and labors of the Apostles, have as festivals a significance inferior to the commemoration of the great facts in the Saviour's history, Dr. Seiss in the Preface justly observes, "they are not minor as to the portions of Scripture noted by the Church for use in their celebration. There is neither major nor minor in what God has caused to be written for the creation of faith and our instruction in righteousness. * * Not only is all Scripture profitable, but the Lectionary for the Minor Festivals is particularly valuable for a complete rounding out of the system that prevails in the arrangement of the Pericopes for the Christian Church Year."

The treatment of these Lessons is accordingly of the same character as that which marks the previous volumes. The Lectures are models of sound evangelical preaching, dealing largely in the exposition of holy

writ, reverent, earnest, practical, refined and eloquent. But we forget that our readers need not be told of the merits of Dr. Seiss' sermons. It is only proper to say that those of this volume measure up to the author's high standard, and show on every page the manifest aim of fixing gospel truth in the understanding, heart and conscience of the hearer. Amid the mass of current sermonic literature, saturated with unbelief, with fanaticism and with sensationalism, we are profoundly thankful that one of the foremost living preachers has left us in permanent form so many discourses surcharged with scriptural doctrine and embodying the whole of that Gospel which is the wisdom of God and the power of God.

The Lectures include the Gospel and the Epistle of eighteen festivals, making altogether thirty-six sermons, to which is added one on Personal Reminiscences, preached May 10th, 1892, on the occasion of the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the author's entry into the ministry, by no means the least interesting or least edifying portion of this volume.

E. J. W.

AMERICAN NEW CHURCH TRACT AND PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILA.

Scripture Testimony Concerning the Other World. In Seven Discourses. By Rev. James Reed. pp. 81.

Marked by the Swedenborgian peculiarities of the author, these discourses prove interesting, healthful, suggestive and profitable reading to thoughtful minds of every school of theology. There are, indeed, some things in them which are not "scripture testimony," and some which contradict "scripture testimony." The Scriptures say, for instance, explicitly of man, that God made him "a little lower than the angels." The author of this volume says: "It has been erroneously supposed that they were a superior order of beings."

On the import of "Hell" some orthodox teachers might get valuable hints. "Many would, if it were possible, blot the word hell out of existence, but no such oblivion is possible so long as the Scriptures are read and treasured as the word of God. Hell is mentioned in the Bible no less than fifty times to describe the state of the wicked." And the following sentence deserves to be graven on the rocks in letters of fire: "Let us not cherish the delusion that we have a right to turn away from truth because it teaches unwelcome things, or because it jars on our natural sensibilities."

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, CHICAGO AND NEW YORK.

The Ivory Palaces of the King. By J. Wilbur Chapman, D. D. pp. 75.

This little book is made up of four brief discourses relating to the way of life. It is evangelical and will be read by many with profit. To

some its chief attractiveness will be its wealth of metaphor, but others will object that the allegorical method is somewhat overworked, and that the author's faculty for illustration is a trifle too conspicuous. The thoughtful reader is frequently startled by statements, made in dead earnest, such as "the boy's sightless eyes flashed with intelligence," his wife's sympathy "made it easy" for the author "to live what this little contains," and the story about the wolves of Scotland "beating" the shepherd's dog. Possibly the Gospel can dispense with such embellishments.

E. J. W.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

The Pillar in the Night. By Rev. J. R. Macduff, D. D., Author of "Morning and Night Watches, etc. pp. 336.

Few writers combine so happily as Dr. Macduff, insight into the heart of the Gospel with the faculty of its application to the needs of men. He brings his readers very close to the bosom of their Saviour, and preëminently such as are in affliction. Thousands have derived precious consolation from the pages of his *Bow in the Cloud*. This much more extended volume is intended as a companion to that. Rather should we say that is the elementary, this the more complete work, the fuller exhibit of the immeasurable riches of consolation provided in Christ for the great company of mourners. This *Pillar in the Night* opens up a pathway to God's sanctuary trodden by the footsteps of sorrow. It is sacred to dimmed eyes and broken hearts, and tender memories. "Moreover, though not exclusively, it is the wide family of the bereaved the writer has chiefly in view." That pillar of cloud and of fire is a most significant "emblem of God's constant presence, his protecting care and love, his sympathy specially in the deep gloom of bereavement."

There are thirty-one meditations, one for each day of the month if so desired, treating, alike with tenderness and power, such themes as The Comforter and his Comforts, Divine Sovereignty, Early Death, Future Recognition, Mysterious Dealings, Light on the Morrow, etc.

The author's guarded pen must have made, we think, several slips on the subject of future recognition. Citing the appearance of Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration the author designates "the one the representative of the risen *dead*, the other of the translated *living*." If Moses represents the risen dead then truly the resurrection is past already, which St. Paul pronounces an error. Again, he says, "The identical Lazarus who lay stricken and neglected at his gate, is further spoken of as carrying on a *conversation*, not between two invisible spirits, but between two recognized personalities." Lazarus' part in that memorable "conversation" between Abraham and Dives is not contained in the reviewer's edition of the New Testament. E. J. W.

The Sermon Bible. II Corinthians--Philippians. pp. 367.

The merits of this work, which has now reached the tenth volume, we have mentioned in previous notices. We can only confirm what we have said before, after examining the present volume, but feel disposed to emphasize more than ever the lists of "references." These will be specially helpful to the preacher. We repeat our caution, too, that such a work should be used legitimately as labor-saving and stimulating to thought, and not to do away with labor.

The Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D. D.. Vol. II., pp. 480.

The First Book of Kings. By F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon of Westminster. pp. 503.

The Epistle to the Philippians. By Robert Rainy, D. D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh. pp. 368.

Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. By Walter F. Adeney, M. A., Professor in New College, London. pp. 404.

The Book of Joshua. By William G. Blaikie, D. D., LL. D., New College, Edinburgh. pp. 416.

The Psalms. By A. Maclaren, D. D. Vol. I. Psalms I.-xxxviii. pp. 385.

All these belong to "The Expositor's Bible" series, under the competent editorial supervision of W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D. The first and last are in the list for 1891-92 and the other four for 1892-93. Recently the publishers have been sending them out more rapidly than usual. The later volumes are by no means falling below the high standard attained by the earlier, and the readers of the *QUARTERLY* have already had our favorable judgment of them. We might discriminate in considering them separately, for there is a difference in merit among them, but where all are good, it is not worth while to refer to different degrees of merit. While thoroughly expository, and adapted to the general reader, the marks of thorough scholarship are apparent throughout.

C. W. BARDEEN, SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Outlines of Surveying and Navigation. For Public Schools and Private Study. By James Pitcher, A. M., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y. To which is appended Washington's Farewell Address, with 100 Questions by J. P. pp. 87 and 34.

Prof. Pitcher has shown exceptional skill in simplifying the processes necessary to become a practical surveyor. He has done this, too, even for the untrained in algebra and geometry. For professional surveying he himself recommends larger works, but these "outlines" will do for the plain surveying usually called for. We are struck by the simplicity

of the rules and the clearness and directness with which his explanations are given—the best elements in a teacher or a maker of text-books. We are surprised that he gets so much in such small compass.

We would not overlook the hundred questions on Washington's Farewell Address. They are aptly put, and the youth who studies the address will find them exceedingly helpful in getting hold of the essential points in it.

JOHN D. WATTLES, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The National Hymn-Book of the American Churches: Comprising the Hymns which are common to the Hymnaries of the Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians and Reformed, with the most usual Tunes. Edited by Robert Ellis Thompson, S. T. D. pp. 188.

The title page gives quite a good idea of the scope of this book. Along with each hymn is a list of the hymn books in which it is found, also its special number in the respective books. The merit of our General Synod book is shown by the number of hymns it has in common with this collection. The purpose of the collection is to meet the wants of union meetings, hotel services and the like, and seems well adapted to this end.

B. GRIFFITH, 1420 CHESTNUT ST., PHILA.

Married Life. Arranged by Mrs. Dora C. W. Spratt.

This little book is composed of suitable selections gathered from the writings of many of the best authors; a page with a marriage certificate ready to be filled; and several blank pages for recording the names of guests present at the wedding. It is designed as a souvenir of the marriage, and where pastors are disposed to give newly married couples something better than the ordinary certificate, this book is very well adapted. It is bound in silver and white and is very attractive.

ADDITIONAL BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Free Church of Scotland. Her Origin Founders and Testimony. By Peter Bayne, LL. D. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y.

Words to Young Christians. Published by same.

Bible Eschatology. By Henry Theodore Cheever, D. D. Lee & Shepard, Boston.

PAMPHLETS.

The Mosaic Record of the Creation Explained. By Abraham G. Jennings. Fleming H. Revel Co., New York and Chicago.

International Lesson System—Its alleged Defects and its Excellencies. P. Anstadt, D. D., Author and Publisher.